Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 – 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-202
Friday
18 October 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-202 CONTENTS *18 October 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NOTICE TO READERS: The United States Government recognizes the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Arms Control & Disarmament

Progress on Conventional Armed Forces Talks 1
  Must Conform to 'Political Realities' *[TASS]* 1
  Agreement on Personnel Cuts *[TASS]* 1
Possibility of Nuclear Strikes Said Unfounded *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Oct]* 1

Worldwide Issues

Shevardnadze Candidate for UN Chief's Post *[TASS]* 2
Further Reportage on Lobov's Visit to Europe 2
  Visits French Naval Base *[TASS]* 2
  Comments on Defense Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Oct]* 2

United States & Canada

KGB Chairman Meets U.S. Ambassador *[TASS]* 2
IZVESTIYA: CIA Veterans Yearn for Past *[16 Oct]* 3
General McPeak Says B-2 'Not Invulnerable' *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 4

Northeast Asia

Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama Departs *[TASS]* 4
Japanese Envoy's Comments on Kurils Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 4
Japan Exerts 'Pressure' on Opinion on Kurils *[PRAVDA 9 Oct]* 5
DPRK Notes U.S. Nuclear Proposal *[Moscow International]* 6
PRAVDA on Korean Nuclear-Free Zone *[7 Oct]* 7

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Pankin To Attend Paris Talks on Cambodia *[TASS]* 7
Concern Voiced Over Khmer Rouge Return *[Moscow International]* 7
Diplomatic Relations Established With Brunei *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* 8
Pacific Military Presence Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 8

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev, Israel's Peres Meet, View Future *[TASS]* 9
  Discuss Restoration of Ties *[INTERFAX]* 9
Foreign Minister Pankin Arrives in Israel *[TASS]* 9
  Gorbachev To Attend Peace Conference *[Moscow TV]* 10
  'Considerable Progress' Noted *[TASS]* 10
  Interviewed by DIE PRESSE *[TASS]* 10
  Levi Hosts Dinner *[TASS]* 11
  Diplomatic Relations Restored *[TASS]* 11
  Upcoming Syria Visit Previewed *[TASS]* 11
  Reportage on Pankin's Visit *[cross-reference]* 12

Israeli Business Delegation Signs Agreement *[IZVESTIYA 14 Oct]* 12
Baker's Talks in Damascus Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 12
U.S. Neutrality as Mideast Mediator Doubted *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 13

East Europe

More on Croatian, Serbian Leaders' Talks *[IZVESTIYA 18 Oct]* 14
  Foreign Ministry Cautious on Results *[INTERFAX]* 14
  Foreign Ministry: No Comment on Coup *[INTERFAX]* 15
  Defense Ministry Denies Coup Link *[INTERFAX]* 15
Romanians Demand Free Passage to Finland *[INTERFAX]* 15
  Continue Rally on Soviet-Finnish Border *[TASS]* 16
  Finland Refuses Visas *[BALTFAX]* 16
New East European Cooperation Group Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 16

West Europe

Presidential Press Service on Erich Honecker *[INTERFAX]* 17
Mitterrand, Kohl Propose European Army *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 17
Gorbachev Greets German Twin Towns Congress *[TASS]* 18

Latin America & Caribbean

Talks on Monitoring Station in Cuba Confirmed *[IZVESTIYA 10 Oct]* 18
Castro Sees 'No Alternative to Revolution' *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 18
Results of 4th Cuban Congress Summarized *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 19
  Moscow Spanish Analyzes Results *[Moscow International]* 20

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Final Deliberations on Economic Agreement 21
  Gorbachev, Yeltsin Discuss Treaty *[Radio Rossii]* 21
  Gorbachev Meets Silayev *[TASS]* 21
  Silayev Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 21
  Volskiy 'Expressed Confidence' *[INTERFAX]* 22
  Council for Entrepreneurship in Favor *[INTERFAX]* 22
  Foreign Experts Give 'Verdict' *[INTERFAX]* 22
First Congress of Soviet Germans Opens 18 Oct 23
  Build Assembly With 'Clout' *[INTERFAX]* 23
  'Closer Than Ever' to Autonomy *[TASS]* 24
Poll Rates Support of Leading Politicians *[INTERFAX]* 24
TASS Carries Press Reviews 24
  16 Oct 24
  17 Oct 25
  18 Oct 27

Economic

Silayev Censures Preservation of 'Old Form' *[INTERFAX]* 28
Experts Forecast Impact of Economic Community *[INTERFAX]* 28
Committee Promotes Formation of Common Market *[TASS]* 29
Economist for Debt Deferment, Deficit Reduction *[Dusseldorf HANDELSBLATT 17 Oct]* 30
Success of Reforms of Market Economy 'Vital' *[Frankfurt am Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 17 Oct]* 30
New 200-Ruble Bank Notes Introduced *[TASS]* 31

Agricultural

Crop Yields Reported Down From Last Year *[INTERFAX]* 31
Significant Rains Complicate Most Harvesting *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 Oct]* 31

Decline in Livestock Causes 'Special Concern' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Oct]* 32
Founding Conference of Peasant Exchange Held *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Sep]* 33
Exchange Goal to 'Arrange Advantageous Sales' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Oct]* 33

Military

Lobov Advocates Collective Defense Structure *[Moscow TV]* 33
Creation of 'Appearance of a Really New Army' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Oct]* 34
Military-Industrial Reduction in Resources *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Oct]* 34
Shaposhnikov Interviewed on Bullies, Deserters *[Moscow Radio]* 35
New Baltic Fleet Commander Yegorov Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Oct]* 35
Army Soldier 'Mainly a Worker and a Peasant' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Oct]* 36
Commentary Justifies Nuclear Testing Moratorium *[Moscow International]* 38
Opinion Poll Concerning Nuclear Arms Control *[INTERFAX]* 38

BALTIC COUNTRIES

Baltic Affairs

Troop Pullout 'Ultimatum' Deplored *[PRAVDA 9 Oct]* 39
'Ultimatums' Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 39
Council Representatives To Review Baltic Laws *[BALTFAX]* 40

Estonia

Savisaar To Lead New Centrist Party *[BALTFAX]* 40
Government To Draft for Military Service *[TASS]* 40
Soviet Officers Issue Address About Status *[INTERFAX]* 40
Bank Official Supports Russian Ruble Move *[BALTFAX]* 41
U.S. Seeks Information on Soviet Forces *[BALTFAX]* 41
Diplomatic Ties Established With South Korea *[INTERFAX]* 41

Latvia

Protests Against Citizenship Proposals *[Riga Radio]* 41
Defense Official on Attending NATO Meeting *[Riga Radio]* 42
Popular Front Chairman on Group's Functioning *[BALTFAX]* 42

Lithuania

Vagnorius Assesses Japan, Korea Trip *[INTERFAX]* 42
Poll Examines Citizenship Options *[Vilnius International]* 42
Commander Views Withdrawal Demands *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 42
Letter Sent to Landsbergis *[TASS]* 43
Moscow Blamed for Delays *[BALTFAX]* 43
Armed Forces Discussed in Vienna *[BALTFAX]* 43
Resolution Anticipates 'Massive' Price Rises *[TASS]* 43
Political Document With Belorussia Pending *[INTERFAX]* 44

RSFSR

Supreme Soviet

Deputies Meet Yeltsin, Propose Candidates *[Radio Rossii]* 45
Yeltsin, Parliament Disagree Over Elections *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 11 Oct]* 45
Parliament Rejects Election Delay Request *[INTERFAX]* 45
Yeltsin Sends Message to Session on Elections *[TASS]* 46
Deputies Fail To Agree on Local Elections *[TASS]* 46
Shakhray Resigns Over Postponement Dispute *[Radio Rossii]* 46
Labor Minister on Government's Reorganization *[TASS]* 47
Interior Ministry Reports on Economic Crime *[INTERFAX]* 47

Federation Affairs

- Gorbachev, Yeltsin on Signing Economic Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 47
- State Counselor Interviewed on Economic Treaty *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Oct]* 48
- Yeltsin Addresses First Congress of Judges *[Radio Rossii]* 53
  - Speaks on Judicial Affairs *[Moscow Radio]* 55
- President Yeltsin Interviewed After 100 Days *[Moscow TV]* 56
- Yeltsin Discusses Republic's Situation *[Russian TV]* 57
- Silayev Addresses Labor Union Congress *[Radio Rossii]* 60
- Transferring of 'Sectoral' Ministries Announced *[INTERFAX]* 60
- Draft on Foreign Trade Intermediation Submitted *[INTERFAX]* 60
- Lopatin: Defense Committee Not Yet Active *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Oct]* 61

Media

- New Evangelical Christian Program Broadcasted *[Radio Rossii]* 63

Local Affairs

- Chechen-Ingushetia Developments Updated *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 63
- President Gamsakhurdia Issues Plea to Georgians *[INTERFAX]* 63
- Tatar President Bans Quasi-Military Bodies *[INTERFAX]* 64
- Referendum Demanded on Tatarstan State System *[INTERFAX]* 64
- Yakutiya To Hold Presidential Vote 20 Dec *[INTERFAX]* 64

International Affairs

- Deputies Discuss Russian-Baltic Accords *[TASS]* 64
- Security Chief on Cooperation With CIA *[TASS]* 64
- Japan's Nakayama Continues Working Visit 65
  - Views Relations With Sobchak *[TASS]* 65
  - Welcomes Economic Reform *[INTERFAX]* 65
  - Discusses Territorial Issue *[Tokyo KYODO]* 65
  - Receives Gift From Kozyrev *[Russian TV]* 66
  - Kunadze Assesses Results of Talks *[Moscow International]* 66
  - Nakayama's Trip Reviewed *[INTERFAX]* 67
- Russia, Japan Continue Debate Over Kurils 68
  - Yeltsin Unhappy With Kunadze Trip *[INTERFAX]* 68
  - Yeltsin Remarks on Five Steps *[Tokyo TV]* 68
  - Two Deputies Reject Handover *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Oct]* 68
  - Letter to Yeltsin Urges Compromise *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 17 Oct]* 73
- St. Petersburg Mayor Ends Prague Visit 75
  - Cites 'New Stage of Interaction' *[TASS]* 75
  - Warns of Dangers of Nationalism *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 75

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

- Kebich Supports Economic Treaty Signing *[Moscow Radio]* 77
  - Parliament Favors Signing *[TASS]* 77
- Currency Introduction, Border Issues Noted *[INTERFAX]* 77
- Chernobyl Closing Suggested *[INTERFAX]* 77

Moldova

- Panel Backs Signing Economic Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 77
- People's Front To Boycott Elections *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 78
  - Snegur Opposition Unites *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 78
  - Youth Party Election Boycott *[AFP]* 78
- Agriculture Minister Guarantees 'No Famine' *[INTERFAX]* 79
- Gasoline Prices Established on Monthly Basis *[INTERFAX]* 79

Ukraine

- Kravchuk Unwilling To Sign Economic Treaty *[TASS]* 79
  - Objections To Treaty Noted *[INTERFAX]* 79
  - Signing 'Postponed' *[Moscow Radio]* 80
- Germany's Genscher Arrives for Visit *[TASS]* 80
- Chairman on Chernobyl Fire Consequences *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 80
  - No Radiation Leak Reported *[Moscow TV]* 80
  - Restoration Work Continues *[TASS]* 81

CAUCASUS

Georgia

- Objections Preclude Signing Economic Agreement *[TASS]* 82
- Opposition Announces Immediate Goals *[INTERFAX]* 82
- Communist Deputies' Activities Banned *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 11 Oct]* 82
- 'Widespread' Ire at Shevardnadze Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 82
- Villages Under Artillery, Missile Attack *[TASS]* 83
  - Tskhinvali Under Fire *[Moscow TV]* 83
- Decree on Uzbek State Independence Noted *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 11 Oct]* 83

Armenia

- Ter-Petrosyan Seen as Election Winner *[INTERFAX]* 83
  - Preliminary Results Reported *[TASS]* 84
  - Election Official Interviewed *[Yerevan Radio]* 84
  - 'Convincing Triumph' Reported *[TASS]* 84
- International Olympic Recognition Sought *[Yerevan Radio]* 85

Azerbaijan

- Mutalibov Marks Italian Joint Venture *[Baku Radio]* 85
- Citizens' Firearms To Be Returned *[Baku Radio]* 85
- Kemerli Resident Reportedly Taken Hostage *[Baku Radio]* 85
- Chernavin in Baku To Discuss Caspian Flotilla *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 86
- Provisions Convoy Leaves for Dzhul'fa Via Iran *[Baku Radio]* 86

Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast

- Russian, Kazakh Observers Begin Contacts *[Yerevan Radio]* 86
  - Foreign Observers Arrive *[INTERFAX]* 86
- Clashes in Mardakert Claim 10 Lives *[INTERAX]* 86
- Newly Created Agency Issues First Bulletin *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 87

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

- Nazarbayev Comments on Talks With Genscher *[Moscow Radio]* 88
  - Genscher Encouraged by Talks *[Hamburg DPA]* 88
  - Meets Ethnic Germans *[INTERFAX]* 88
  - Closer Contacts Sought *[INTERFAX]* 89

Tajikistan

- Rumors of Opposition Leaders' Deaths Decried *[INTERFAX]* 89

Turkmenia

Economic, Political Situation Assessed [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Oct] 89
President Niyazov Views Economic Union [TASS] 90

Uzbekistan

Muslims Demand Mufti's Replacement [INTERFAX] 90

Arms Control & Disarmament

Progress on Conventional Armed Forces Talks

Must Conform to 'Political Realities'

LD1710171891 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna October 17 TASS— The military activities and the training of armed forces are the subject of discussion at the current seminar here.

Practically all speakers at today's session of the seminar, which has drawn high-ranking military figures from the CSCE member-states, were unanimous that this aspect of the development of the armed forces must conform to new political realities and to the spirit of the times.

"Over recent years, the Soviet Union went to a tangible reduction in military activities on land, at sea and in the air," Colonel General Gherman Burutin, deputy chief of the main operations department of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, pointed out in a report at the seminar.

"First of all, the number of large-scale combined-arms exercises has considerably diminished. The training of troops for large-scale offensive operations or their deployment for forestalling strikes have been fully excluded from military practice.

"In prospect, the Soviet Union does not see the need for big exercises, still less for large-scale maneuvers, considering the changed military and political situation in europe and the world", Burutin said.

Agreement on Personnel Cuts

LD1710180191 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna October 17 TASS—Progress has been made here at the current talks on conventional armed forces in Europe in the elaboration of an agreement on personnel cuts, speakers at today's concluding full-delegation session of the present round of the talks emphasised.

Political analysts believe that the results of the work done make it possible to state that a really important stage has been traversed.

Practically all countries submitted numerical data on their armed forces and elucidated these figures. Full information of the personnel of each of the negotiating party is now available. The coinciding elements in the structures of the armed forces and the actual differences of structures have become clearer. As a result, the likely outline of a future agreement and main categories of personnel subject to cutbacks are more manifest.

"Considering the situation taking shape at the talks, we deem it timely and utterly topical to move in the near future to the elaboration of text of the agreement," Soviet Chief Delegate Oleg Grinevskiy told TASS.

"We suggest that our partners make use of the forthcoming recess and take up the preparation of texts that could be used for coordinating a final document.

"No progress is seen, unfortunately, as regards the talks' another [as received] aspect concerning getting agreement on stabilisation measures.

"Our Western partners have been for long promising to present their specific position on the issue to us but promises remain just promises. Naturally, such a state of things gives rise to serious concern," Grinevskiy said.

Possibility of Nuclear Strikes Said Unfounded

PM1810113291 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Report on interview with Konstantin Kobets, Russian state adviser for defense, by unidentified RIA correspondent in Moscow, under "Direct Line" rubric—date of interview not stated: "General Kobets Refutes Reports"]

[Text] Moscow—Army General Konstantin Kobets, Russian state adviser for defense, described as "nonsense that no sensible person would credit" the MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI report that "last week, behind the scenes in the Russian Government, the question of the possibility of an exchange of nuclear strikes between independent Ukraine and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] was discussed."

"These questions have not been raised, neither at the State Committee for Defense, nor in any other Russian structure, nor at the State Council, nor at the Council of Ministers," Gen. Kobets told a RIA correspondent. "There is no possibility even of embarking on theoretical discussions on this subject."

The state adviser also called into question the reliability of a report in London's THE INDEPENDENT newspaper, which, citing Vitaliy Shlykov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Defense, wrote that the United States is helping Russia to set up defenses against missiles accidentally or deliberately launched from the territory of other states.

"As an expert and a highly trained professional, no way could Shlykov have made those statements," Gen. Kobets said. "This question has not yet been raised even within the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on creating a joint ABM defense system as part of an integrated system of collective security. The approaches to this still have to be found." He said that it can only be a question of studying questions of exchanging information on the launch, trajectory, and flight plane of a missile from a given territory.

Worldwide Issues

Shevardnadze Candidate for UN Chief's Post

LD1710180991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1521 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)—According to a member of the USSR Foreign Ministry staff, Eduard Shevardnadze, former head of this department, is one of the 10 candidates for the post of UN secretary general. This was revealed today by the weekly MOSCOW NEWS. [passage omitted]

The source refused to give the names of the other candidates for the post of UN leader. Yet it is very possible that Mikhail Gorbachev may become one of Eduard Shevardnadze's rivals. Gorbachev has repeatedlly pointed out that he will not go down in history as the leader who presided over the disintegration of the USSR. [passage omitted]

Further Reportage on Lobov's Visit to Europe

Visits French Naval Base

LD1810044191 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Shvets]

[Text] Paris October 17 TASS—A Soviet military delegation on Wednesday [16 October] visited a French naval base in Toulon and the Jean Bart frigate and met the Mediterranean Naval District command.

"The Mediterranean should be a space of understanding between all peoples living on its coasts and a sea uniting everybody, rather than separating them," head of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff Vladimir Lobov, leading the delegation, told a news conference in Toulon.

Lobov said he was glad the NATO countries and the Soviet Union had ceased to be enemies. "The more trust there is between us, the higher the level of security in Europe and the world will be," Lobov said.

At the same time, Lobov noted that there are differences between NATO and the Soviet Union on naval arms. He said it is necessary to begin talks on the issue.

Comments on Defense Issues

PM1710152391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Official Information"]

[Text] Army General Vladimir Lobov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, who is on an official visit to France, has held talks with Admiral Jacques Lanxade, chief of staff of the French Armed Forces, and met with Defense Minister Pierre Joxe. The Soviet military delegation laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Paris.

The program of the general staff chief's visit—which is being carried out within the framework of the Soviet-French agreement on cooperation in the military sphere—includes a discussion with the French Armed Forces leadership and National Assembly deputies on general problems of European security, the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe, and the recent U.S. and Soviet initiatives in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. Army Gen. V. Lobov will also visit a number of French Land Forces, Air Force, and Navy military installations and garrisons, including a division of intermediate-range ballistic missiles on the Albion Plateau.

The visit is taking place in an exceptionally frank and constructive atmosphere, V. Lobov stated in an interview with a TASS correspondent. These contacts are becoming regular and acquiring a firm character. We exchanged opinions and compared viewpoints. I think that the visit will serve as one more step in strengthening relations between our countries and their armed forces.

French leaders are primarily interested in the situation in the USSR and the prospects for preserving economic and political union, the chief of the general staff noted. This question noticeably worries them, and much depends on resolving it, including giving us economic aid. France has an interest in preserving the union, since this ensures stability in Europe.

Problems of reducing strategic nuclear weapons were also discussed. Pretty sharp discussions took place; we advocated ending nuclear weapons tests. The French leaders insist that it is necessary to hold tests for as long as such weapons exist, but intend to reduce the number of nuclear explosions, V. Lobov said.

Appeciable interest is being shown in France in the position of the republics on military-political problems. In this respect V. Lobov noted that on the whole the republics favor keeping a single army and a single leadership for the strategic nuclear forces, with the creation of a system of collective defense. The search for a form of such a defense is now under way.

United States & Canada

KGB Chairman Meets U.S. Ambassador

LD1710195291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)—KGB Chairman Vadim Bakatin received U.S. Ambassador Robert Strauss in Moscow today.

State Security Committee sources told a TASS correspondent that the meeting lasted more than an hour and was held in a constructive, business-like atmosphere.

IZVESTIYA: CIA Veterans Yearn for Past

PM1710133791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[By special correspondent V. Nadein: "The CIA Pines for the KGB of Old, and the Feeling Is Perhaps Mutual"]

[Text] Washington—The difficulties experienced by the Soviet KGB found a strange echo during the traditional annual meeting of U.S. intelligence service veterans.

"I am pleased I was born in 1922 rather than 1952," former CIA Assistant Director John Blake told his despondent colleagues. "At least my generation knew who the enemy was, and our enemy was monolithic."

Although active intelligence officers, unlike former ones, are far less frank, Richard Kerr, current acting CIA chief, did not hold back his melancholy either: "We will remember the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact with great nostalgia for a long time to come. We had an enemy whom we understood."

Deprived of their good old rival, the intelligence officers have discovered one no longer overseas but in their own country. They have mounted a concerted attack upon the mass media and Congress, which "exploit for their own personal ends" leaks of secret information from the intelligence departments.

"The real issue is whether it is possible to maintain secrecy at all in the existing conditions," said former CIA Director Richard Helms. "The cold war has perhaps come to an end at the right time. I am not sure that, given current Congress interference in the intelligence departments' work, we can really count upon the level of secrecy that should exist."

In a report on the traditional annual gathering of former staffers of the CIA, FBI, National Security Agency, and military intelligence, THE WASHINGTON POST claims that the past period has shown an extremely low standard of analytical activity on the part of all the aforementioned services, because not a single one of the very important forecasts they have made, particularly concerning the Soviet Union, has been borne out in practice.

The dismay felt by former and current spies exists to a comparable extent on both sides of the ocean and reflects the deeper fears of a large number of high-ranking officials of both superpowers. They have not simply been caught unawares by the new development of events. They are receiving more and more proof of their redundancy.

From this standpoint, the disarmament initiatives that the U.S. and USSR presidents recently exchanged are instructive. What Bush and Gorbachev have recently done themselves usually took ministers, generals, and experts decades. The negotiation processes dragged on so long that generations of highly paid officials were able to grow to maturity and old age, comfortably ensconced in ancient palaces, only rarely traveling from Geneva to Vienna or from Helsinki to Paris. Many observers got the impression that the most involved problems would have been far more easily resolved if the diplomats had been paid for the end result rather than the process of negotiation.

The 700-page treaty on reducing strategic offensive arms, to which almost 10 years of titanic effort were devoted, was rendered obsolete during the three days of the putsch. But it is worth remembering that the numerous delegations that tortured themselves with sleepless nights in Moscow and Washington would simply have failed to resolve the last two contradictions if Mikhail Gorbachev had not intervened in the matter and ordered his deep-thinking experts just hours before the London summit meeting: Cut the talk, the treaty will be signed as it is.

The treaty was signed, and the sky did not cave in. Today you will scarcely find a dozen people on the planet who remember what was the nub of the seemingly intractable differences that consumed various ministers and marshals for six months.

These people remain influential in their countries. They have arrogated to themselves the assessment of security and are waging a vigorous public "education" campaign. The fact that the CIA is nostalgic about the good old KGB is just the tip of the iceberg. The fact that the departments, which have a vested interest in the presence of a treacherous and intransigent enemy, are seeking to find or create it is far more important.

The participants in the assembly of former U.S. intelligence service agents passed a decision to employ every means to counter the attacks on the intelligence service. They intend to address meetings of students and schoolchildren and give newspaper and television interviews. Their association was set up in 1975—at the very time when public hearings of abuse in the intelligence service were taking place in the U.S. Congress and rocking the whole country.

There have, unfortunately, been no similar hearings in the USSR. The numerous KGB crimes against law and morality and its uncontrolled use of enormous sums of rubles and foreign currency (all this is described in dozens of documents published abroad) will presumably be investigated by the new people in the organization like Bakatin and Primakov.

Experience, however, shows that hope pinned on courageous individuals does not obviate the need for close public monitoring of potentially dangerous intelligence organs. With rare exceptions, our spies are not inclined to be talkative, let alone to set up professional clubs and associations open to the public.

Were they a tad franker, we would clearly see that the CIA's nostalgia for the enemy it knows is of a professional rather than an ideological nature, and for that reason it can venture to count upon complete reciprocity.

General McPeak Says B-2 'Not Invulnerable'

PM1610084191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 1

[Under the "Pulse of the Day" heading]

[Text] General Merrell McPeak, USAF chief of staff, made a statement 9 October that was unusually frank for a high-ranking Pentagon representative. Talking with journalists at the Defense Department, he stated that the latest U.S. bomber, the B-2, which is being built using Stealth technology that makes it invisible to enemy radar, is possibly not invulnerable to Soviet air defense systems.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama Departs

LD1710194191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)—Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama, who has been on a working visit to the USSR, left for home today. Today he visited St. Petersburg, where he met the city's mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak, and went sightseeing. Before flying home to Japan, Taro Nakayama made a short stop in Moscow.

Japanese Envoy's Comments on Kurils Assessed

92UF0072A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 91 Union Edition p 6

[Article by A. Anichkin: "Tokyo Counts on a 'Fresh Start' in the Territorial Dispute, but Conditions Remain the Same"]

[Text] The staff of the Japanese Embassy in Moscow complain privately: Such a pace of work has been set that we have neither energy nor time left for "private life." The August coup and the subsequent redistribution of political forces in the Soviet Union, the stronger-than-ever voice of Russia, as well as the significant fact of the appearance of new players in the Union and Russian Ministries of Foreign Affairs give Tokyo hopes for a speedy—speedier than could have been expected to date—resolution of the "territorial issue."

On 14-15 October, Taro Nakayama, Japanese minister of foreign affairs, will hold talks in Moscow. Despite the fact that technically these are regular Soviet-Japanese consultations at the foreign minister level, the meetings are going to be extremely important for the future tonality of relations between our two countries.

Japanese Ambassador Sumio Edamura, who talked to an IZVESTIYA correspondent several days ago, believes that the August victory of forces advocating democracy has clearly expressed the will of the Soviet people to put an end to the totalitarian heritage in this country. Apparently, the Japanese side includes in this heritage the territorial dispute—an acknowledged fact in our relations after President Gorbachev's visit to Tokyo.

The ambassador said: "We look at you as an old partner that has been in a sense born anew. I hope that now you will be a partner with whom we share common values. We will be able to take a fresh look at the territorial dispute on this basis." Ambassador Edamura believes that the signing of a peace treaty between our countries as soon as possible will not be merely the elimination of an anachronism but also our duty to the world community. In his words, the concept regarding the need to reject the approach to bilateral relations as those of "victor and vanquished," which was voiced during a recent visit to Tokyo by Ruslan Khasbulatov, leader of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, caused great enthusiasm in Japan.

Despite there still being no clarity as to how powers will be divided between the Union and the Russian Ministries of Foreign Affairs in the course of negotiations with Japan, the Japanese diplomats, in the words of Mr. Edamura, believe the new, greater role of Russia as a sovereign republic next to Japan to be quite natural. The ambassador praised highly the professionalism of the employees of the Union Ministry of Foreign Affairs and their ability to practically implement the principles of new thinking. At the same time, he referred to the already established good cooperation with the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In Japan, they count on dealing during negotiations with a position and approaches that have been coordinated by the two departments.

The ambassador believes that the "numerical approach" to Japanese-Soviet relations and continuously circulating rumors about "credits for islands" transactions being prepared to be vulgar and humiliating for both parties. He says that the results of negotiations cannot be measured in the value of credit or loans. It is hard to disagree with the ambassador when he says that he altogether fails to understand on the basis of what analysis statistics referred to in the press have been calculated—between $8 and $15 billion mentioned during R. Khasbulatov's visit to Tokyo, or the proposal concerning $30 billion that I. Ozawa, general secretary of the Liberal Democratic Party at the time, supposedly brought to Moscow. "These numbers indicate the tremendous potential for our cooperation and the high hopes attached to it by Russia rather than reflect the real needs of your economy." As the ambassador announced, groups specially created at the embassy, the missions of the Japanese Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Industry, and Finance, are now working vigorously in order to determine "the real needs."

No matter how the fate of the territories is decided, the main point is apparently not to disregard the fate of those who live there at present, as has frequently been the case in our country. Many of the 30,000 present-day inhabitants of the south Kuril Islands were born and grew up on the islands, which during this time became their small motherland. They are still kept in the dark and are alarmed; this is merely exacerbated by reports from Moscow.

However, what is the attitude of the Japanese side toward this human factor? By the end of World War II, 17,000 Japanese resided on the islands. All of them were evicted in the subsequent years without any compensation. Will their drama not be repeated in reverse? Ambassador Edamura said: "I would like to assure you that the views and interests of the present-day inhabitants of the islands will definitely be taken into account to a sufficient degree. Forcible resettlement is a tragedy. I know that not only the Japanese residents of the northern islands but also many Soviet people lived through the same in the era of totalitarian rule. We believe that replicating the tragic experience of those Japanese with regard to the current inhabitants of the islands is absolutely impermissible. I believe that the former Japanese residents of these islands themselves understand this well. This is why it is quite natural for the Japanese Government to attentively take this into account in resolving this issue."

The ambassador was not inclined to dramatize belligerent statements by some politicians who are categorically against the transfer of the islands to Japan. "I hope that genuine patriots and politicians who have common sense understand that a fair and legitimate resolution of the issue of the Northern Territories is in the supreme interest of all the people of your country, including the inhabitants of the islands and all residents of Sakhalin Oblast, as well as all residents of Japan," said Mr. Edamura.

Nonetheless, can the ambassador envision a resolution of the issue of the Northern Territories that would not leave a festering wound in the future national self-awareness of the Russians, just as "the islands occupied by the Russians" have turned into a symbol of infringed national pride for the Japanese, to be sure, through the efforts of the politicians of the cold war era? Ambassador Edamura said: "I believe that a solution based on justice, legality, and the principles of international law would not leave anyone unsatisfied."

So far, the search for a fair and legitimate resolution of the issue has boiled down to an implacable "clash of arguments." Both sides have accumulated many of them in decades of talks, but all of them created an impasse. All of them ran into one question: Who should have sovereignty over the islands? This time, the ambassador also responded tersely to my question about whether Japan considers the issue of its sovereignty over the islands to be the main point in solving this problem: "Absolutely correct."

The hopes that the Japanese attach to the new spirit of democracy in Moscow are understandable. However, it should perhaps also be understood that the line separating the proponents of turning the disputed islands over to Japan from the opponents of such a "compromise" does not at all coincide with the line separating conservatives from democrats. Will we not face an impasse once again? Will we find a unifying idea, a vision of the future of our relations that will make it possible to transcend a simple exchange of arguments?

The ambassador said resolutely: "I would not spend time and make an effort to do this job if I did not believe that a solution may be found. Indeed, at present a realistic opportunity for a 'fresh start' in our negotiations exists. The new situation in your country gives us grounds for such hopes. We are prepared to embark on a new effort and to see values which unite us."

Japan Exerts 'Pressure' on Opinion on Kurils

92UF0062A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 91 Single Edition p 4

[By correspondent I. Latyshev: "Russians—Citizens of Japan? How Attempts Are Being Made in the Land of the Rising Sun To Exert Pressure on Soviet Public Opinion"]

[Text] Tokyo—In mid-October Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama will visit Moscow, where he will have talks with the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and also meetings with the presidents of the Soviet Union and Russia, M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin, respectively. In his statements in parliament for the media neither the minister himself nor his aides are making any secret of what he intends to talk about at these meetings. T. Nakayama and other leaders of the Japanese Foreign Ministry are openly emphasizing that they see an insistence on the immediate transfer to Japan of the so-called Northern Territories as the main purpose of the upcoming negotiations.

This is explained primarily by the dubious belief of local politicians that in the present critical economic and political situation "an opportunity unprecedented since the war" has been created for the realization of the above-mentioned territorial claims. Proceeding from this conviction, during the impending negotiations Nakayama intends to obtain the islands in exchange for a promise to grant the Soviet Union some economic assistance in the form of large amounts of credit—credit the Japanese Government is not yet agreeing to yet, confining itself merely to so-called "humanitarian assistance."

Increasingly noticeable in Nakayama's recent statements has been the confidence with which he has been predicting that the Soviet leadership, as well as the RSFSR leadership, would abandon the former intractability on this contentious issue and accommodate Japan's territorial claims. A vivid manifestation of this was the minister's recent speech in the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Japanese parliament's House of Representatives. Responding to an inquiry from a member of the opposition, Nakayama suddenly gave himself over to arguments to the effect that Japan should even now be embarking on the active elaboration of the legal provisions by which our compatriots residing on the four southern islands are to be guided after they have been transferred... to Japanese administration (?!). The Japanese minister expressed here the assumption that some of the inhabitants of the said islands would have to be resettled in other parts of the Soviet Union, while others would be allowed to remain. His explanations reveal that the authorities could in time even issue to the latter "residence permits" similar, by all accounts, to those which are issued here to Koreans who were born in Japan, some of whom have now become Japanese citizens even, after having agreed to forget their genealogical name and substitute Japanese names for their first and last names.

The minister explained the importance of accelerating a detailed elaboration of the future legal status of the Kuril inhabitants on the threshold of their transition to Japanese administrative control by the need to stimulate psychological pressure on the consciousness and mood of the inhabitants of the south Kurils at this stage.

One wonders if the fact that these obviously inappropriate statements were heard in parliament was any accident. By no means: The aspiration to step up propaganda pressure on our compatriots—the inhabitants of the Kuril Islands—and, simultaneously, of course, on the Japanese themselves is increasingly noticeable in Japan today. One of the best-known local Sovietologists, Sigeki Hakamada, for example, a professor at Aoyama Gakuen University who had just returned from the Soviet Union, where, incidentally, he had taken a trip to Sakhalin Oblast, recently delivered a lecture on Tokyo television. He directed the entire burden of his speech toward emphasizing the "importance" of strengthening Japan's propaganda influence on the Kuril inhabitants, who are "concerned for their future" in connection with talk about the possibility of transferring the four islands to Japan. Addressing all Japanese who have dealings with Soviet people, Hakamada recommended that they influence in every possible way Soviet "public opinion," which he says remains currently "the main obstacle to a solution of the territorial question."

The Japanese side is already exerting such influence. A large group of Japanese citizens who recently visited Kunashir and Iturup under a non-visa agreement, allegedly on their own initiative, conducted there something akin to a "mass poll," whose data were subsequently published by all Japanese mass media. The results of this "poll" were entirely satisfactory to the local leaders of the "movement for the return of the Northern Territories" for, if they are to be believed, it transpires that today most inhabitants of the south Kurils no longer "rule out the possibility" of the transfer of the islands to Japan, although they do not "yet" support such a transfer.

Illusions concerning the imaginary "readiness" of the Soviet community for concessions toward the Japanese claims are thus being sown in Japanese public opinion. But reality is continually dispelling such illusions. Local champions of the territorial claims on our country were greatly disheartened, for example, by the reports that made their way into the Japanese press concerning the sharply negative reaction of the inhabitants of the Kurils and all of Sakhalin Oblast to the attempt by G.F. Kunadze, deputy RSFSR foreign minister who was there recently, to dispose the local population toward consent to the transfer to Japan of part of the Kuril Islands. News of the radio speech by V. Fedorov, chairman of the Sakhalin Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, condemning this attempt and calling for the creation in the oblast of a headquarters of struggle for the Kuril Islands, was published by all Tokyo newspapers. Reading these reports, millions of Japanese are beginning to gain a clearer understanding of how difficult a mutually acceptable solution of the so-called "territorial question" is, how negative the results produced by any power pressure in approaching this question are, and how illusory the hopes of Tokyo politicians to use our country's economic difficulties to dispose it toward unilateral concessions to such pressure.

DPRK Notes U.S. Nuclear Proposal

SK1710054691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1100 GMT 16 Oct 91

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The DPRK Embassy in the Soviet Union held a news conference with Soviet reporters on 15 October.

Son Song-pil, DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, explained his government's stand on the U.S. President's proposal for unilateral withdrawal of nuclear weapons from U.S. military bases in the ROK.

According to the DPRK leadership, this measure will contribute to easing the situation on the Korean peninsula and to converting the peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

The ambassador also talked about the fate of Yi In-mo, a former war correspondent who has been detained in ROK prisons since he was captured as a prisoner of war during the 25 June war.

He has appealed to international institutions and reporters from many countries to take steps to have Yi In-mo and all the political offenders imprisoned in South Korea set free.

PRAVDA on Korean Nuclear-Free Zone

PM1110154891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 91 Single Edition p4

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Viewpoint" article: "Nuclear-Free Peninsula"]

[Text] On the one hand, this heading should be accompanied by a question mark. But, on the other hand, there should be no doubting the possibility of turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

Washington's recent decision to unilaterally eliminate its entire arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons was primarily addressed to Moscow. It has prompted a very special response in Pyongyang and Seoul, however, because it could resolve some very complex problems in relations between North and South Korea and thereby contribute to the reunification of this divided nation.

The situation is this: Although North Korea signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 1985, it will only allow IAEA inspectors to visit its installations if the United States removes its nuclear potential from South Korea. But it is well known that all the U.S. warheads in that country come under the category of tactical weapons, which are now due to be scrapped.

The U.S. President's statement on the intention to unilaterally eliminate all tactical nuclear weapons stationed in other countries was immediately given a positive appraisal by Pyongyang. An official statement released by the DPRK Foreign Ministry said that, if the United States really does remove these weapons from South Korea, this will open the way to an agreement on nuclear guarantees and make it possible to proclaim the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone, which the DPRK Government has wanted for a long time.

For his part, ROK President No Tae-u has said that Washington's initiative will have an impact on the entire security system in the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia as a whole. He has instructed his military department to draw up confidence-building measures between the two Korean states, abandon confrontation in relations between them, and create the preconditions for cooperation between North and South Korea in the United Nations in connection with their simultaneously joining this organization.

According to press reports, all U.S. nuclear facilities are stored at Kunsan Air Base, 180 km from Seoul. The total number of warheads has been reduced several times in recent years, and now approximately 100 units are left, mainly artillery shells and land mines.

There are reports that the South Korean authorities are discussing the possibility of issuing a joint Washington-Seoul declaration to the effect that there are no nuclear weapons in the south of the peninsula. They would like to time this step to coincide with President Bush's visit to the Republic of Korea, scheduled for the end of November. So there is not much time for the evacuation.

Encouraging news, in short. The preconditions now exist for radically easing the situation in the Korean peninsula, which is one of the last remaining borders of the cold war.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Pankin To Attend Paris Talks on Cambodia

LD1710125191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1219 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin will take part in the second session of the international conference on Cambodia in Paris at the end of October. A TASS correspondent was informed at the Soviet Foreign Ministry that on 23 October the minister will sign an agreement on behalf of the USSR on a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian conflict.

The official visit to France by the USSR Foreign Minister will take place from 24 to 25 October.

Concern Voiced Over Khmer Rouge Return

BK1210052791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1100 GMT 11 Oct 91

[Commentary by Viktor Valentinov]

[Text] As we have reported, on 23 October an agreement on a political and comprehensive solution to the Cambodian conflict will be signed in Paris. The draft agreement worked out at the UN offices has already been agreed upon and adopted by all political forces involved in the Cambodian conflict.

The last to agree to sign this document was the Khmer Rouge, the opposition group with the most fighting capability and the group responsible for the massacre of the Cambodian people from 1975 until the end of 1978. Why have the Khmer Rouge decided to cooperate with other political forces? This question was raised by our observer Viktor Valentinov.

As people know, at the previous round of talks it was this group that usually stuck to an intransigent stance more than others, moving in unpredictable directions. Everyone is worried about the Pol Pot group, the leaders of the Khmer Rouge, using some pretext to go back on their promise. They have done so many times before. Our observer Viktor Valentinov continues:

The attitude adopted by the Khmer Rouge at the final round of negotiations was not a result of just the unanimity of views of UN member countries, including China, although this undoubtedly played a role. More importantly, in my view, this attitude was due to the head of the Phnom Penh Government, Comrade Hun Sen, and the former Cambodian head of state, Samdech

Norodom Sihanouk, who both realistically managed to agree and set up a political force that leaves no room for the Khmer Rouge except to sign the agreement.

On this point I would like to particularly mention the contributions made by Phnom Penh and its ability to abandon outdated thinking and accept reality. On this issue, it is worth quoting from the interview that Comrade Prime Minister of the Phnom Penh Government granted a few days ago to the French paper L'HUMANITE. I would like to note that this paper is the organ of the French Communist Party.

Comrade Hun Sen says in essence: The peace agreement we are going to sign in the near future is the best solution compared to others we have noted in the past four years. This agreement is a compromise acceptable to all parties. This is a view worth all kinds of respect. Phnom Penh has made efforts to make concessions acceptable to all parties. In fact, not long ago attempts were successively made to sign an agreement that would allow one party to have the edge, openly or secretly, over other parties. This is why those negotiations failed and weapons were used instead, causing bloodshed. It is obvious that attempts to have the upper hand were originally made by the Khmer Rouge relying on their military power. This is why this overture by the Pol Pot group did not inspire confidence among negotiation partners. It can be said that even today not many have such confidence. Comrade Hun Sen openly admits that the Cambodian people are genuinely concerned over the Khmer Rouge's return to the political arena. A major conclusion, however, has already been reached by Phnom Penh.

In the interview granted to L'HUMANITE, Comrade Hun Sen continues: We have reached the following conclusion—that we had to fight to achieve peace or search for peace in order to achieve genuine peace. We chose the latter, says Comrade Hun Sen. This is the conclusion successively arrived at by Phnom Penh. Despite concerns over the Khmer Rouge return, Comrade Hun Sen cannot ignore that the Khmer Rouge are part of Cambodia's political life.

To this day, it is less than two weeks before leaders of all Cambodian parties sign the peace agreement. After the signing, new problems will emerge; however, these will be those of a peaceful Cambodia, concludes our observer Viktor Valentinov.

Diplomatic Relations Established With Brunei

PM1410134391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 91 Moscow Evening Edition p 3

["Diplomatic Relations Established Between USSR and Brunei Darussalam"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister B.D. Pankin and Brunei Darussalam Foreign Minister Mohamed Bolkiah have signed a communique in Washington on establishing diplomatic relations between the two states. In it the sides express their readiness to develop relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence, which meets both countries' interests and will promote the maintenance of peace and the development of international relations.

Brunei Darussalam is a small state in Southeast Asia north of the island of Kalimantan. Its territory is 5,800 square km, and the population is 242,000. It is an absolute monarchy. The head of state is Sultan Muda Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzaddin Waddaulah.

Until 1984 Brunei was a protectorate of Great Britain. Oil and gas production forms the basis of the economy (10 million tonnes of oil and 120 billion cubic meters of gas).

Pacific Military Presence Pondered

PM1710110591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 91 Union Edition p 10

[Candidate of Historical Sciences E. Grebenshchikov (Center for Japanese and Pacific Studies at the Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute) article: "Both the United States and the USSR Are Obliged To Close Their Military Bases"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA No. 227 dated 23 September 1991 published an article entitled "Cam Ranh Without Secrets or Exoticism" with the subheading "What is the Fate of Our Naval Base in Vietnam?" The newspaper's own correspondent in Hanoi admitted that "now is not the most suitable time to start talking about the preservation of military parity, which has ruined the state and bled our economy white." It looks like an indisputable statement. Yet what parity was in question or should be?

Let us just start off with the fact that the United States is already implementing a program for a 10 to 12 percent reduction in the military presence in the Asia-Pacific area, dictated by budgetary needs to economize and by the changed situation in the region. At the same time, the scale of reductions will obviously be greater in practice now that the activity of the largest air base, Clark Field in the Philippines, has been de facto discontinued because of the eruption of the volcano. The fate of the Subic Bay naval base is hanging in the air, too. U.S. military-political thinking is now tending toward placing emphasis on the ensuring access to bases and strongpoints for U.S. Armed Forces at times of crisis in various subregions in the Asia-Pacific Region rather than on a massive military presence.

Any suspicions about Moscow's plans and intentions have been virtually dispelled.

As for the Vietnamese leadership, which, strictly speaking, will have to make the decision, it has by all accounts, as IZVESTIYA has reported citing foreign news agencies, already probed U.S. reaction to a possible invitation to return to Cam Ranh Bay, the development of which the Americans started and we continued.

Soviet-U.S. cooperation can and in all probability should be part of a wider scheme of some kind of multilateral plan that started being actively discussed in the Asia-Pacific Region recently. At the same time, no one is encroaching on the U.S.-Japanese alliance, which has a deciding role, whereas Soviet-U.S. contacts and arrangements [soglasovaniya] would have an auxiliary role.

The growing pressure of economic factors, however, is forcing us too to think of withdrawing.

But then the following unexpected question arises. Will not the balance of forces be too seriously uspet if both the USSR and the U.S. military presences in Southeast Asia wane simultaneously? And from this point of view, IZVESTIYA's article is welcome: It is an invitation to joint reflection and a joint search for a solution.

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev, Israel's Peres Meet, View Future

LD1810085791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1654 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev today met Shim'on Peres, a prominent political figure in Israel, former prime minister and the leader of the Labor Party, who had arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the International Fund for Survival and Development of Mankind.

At the request of the guest, the president briefly described the situation in the USSR. At present all efforts are aimed at overcoming the disintegrating consequences of the putsch, he noted, and at moving toward the new Union step by step. The forthcoming signing of the economic agreement, which is to take place on 18 October, is a sign of progress in this direction. Its implementation will enable the processes that are disrupting the economy to be turned back and will prevent a further deterioration in the life of the population, which is the main and the most burning problem.

Shim'on Peres said that things done by the great Soviet people in the last six years are of historical importance to mankind. The world is following present events in the USSR with great attention and is deeply interested in preserving its integrity and status as a great power. While discussing the situation in the Near East, the president supported his interlocutor's ideas, particularly that Israel and the Arabs, in their approach to the problem of a Near East settlement and their future relations, must take account of the new situation that has taken shape in the region and the world as a whole, of changed security criteria, and of the requirements of economic cooperation.

The conviction that real peace in the region can be based only on the genuine balance of interests on all sides was expressed at the meeting. Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union, together with the United States, will play its constructive role in the launching and developing of the negotiation process at the Near East conference, but that Israel and Arabic participants should play their own role. The president concluded by saying that everyone in this "orchestra" has his own "part." A common opinion was expressed that ties between the USSR and Israel have a big future. The president stated that the USSR is standing "at the threshold of restoring diplomatic relations with Israel."

Discuss Restoration of Ties

OW1810114691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0737 GMT 18 Oct 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In the Kremlin today, Mikhail Gorbachev conferred with the former Israeli Prime Minister Shim'on Peres, who is the leader of Labor Party. Revealing some details of the meeting, the press attache of the Israeli Consulate in the USSR, Yousef Ben Dor told DP's [DIPLOMATIC PANORAMA] correspondent that different issues were under discussion: the state of affairs in the USSR, the situation in the Middle East, the development of Soviet-Israeli relations, and regional cooperation.

In connection with the upcoming renewal of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel M. Gorbachev said that this process is irreversible and that diplomatic ties will be reestablished as soon as the exact time for convening a conference on peace in the Middle East is fixed. According to M. Gorbachev, the USSR will restore diplomatic relations with Israel before the conference begins its work.

Shim'on Peres thanked the Soviet President for what he described as "opening the gates" for the emigration of ethnic Jews to Israel. He also praised M. Gorbachev for his opposition to anti-Semitism and other forms of ethnic and racial discrimination.

Foreign Minister Pankin Arrives in Israel

LD1710155491 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By special correspondents Aleksandr Zhudro and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Tel Aviv October 17 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin today arrived in Israel, beginning his six-day working tour of the Middle East aimed at completing preparations for a Middle East peace conference. The minister is also planning to visit Syria, Jordan and Egypt.

Pankin is due to hold talks with his Israeli colleague on a broad range of issues connected with the situation in the Middle East and bilateral relations. The agenda includes talks on restoring full-scale diplomatic relations between the two countries, broken in 1967.

The Soviet minister is expected to meet Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir. In Jerusalem, Pankin is planning to meet U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Palestinian activists from the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

At Ben Gurion Airport, Pankin was met by Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi and other officials.

"We aim to contribute to establishing stable and just peace in the Middle East," Pankin said in the airport.

The Soviet Union, the United States and all interested sides have exerted efforts to start a Middle East peace conference as soon as possible, Pankin said.

"The initiation of a full-blooded negotiation process is needed to put an end to military confrontation, mutual bitterness and mistrust in the region," Pankin said. He hopes the peace process will help formulate a mutually acceptable compromise on the basis of a balance of all countries' interest.

Speaking about Soviet-Israeli relations, he said "we are ready to make everything possible to remove all obstacles on the road to normal civilised contacts between our countries and upgrade these relations to correspond to our peoples' interests and the interest of peace in the region and outside it".

Levi said Israel wants to live in peace with its neighbours. He said he hoped that the peace process will lead to establishing peace in the region.

From the airport, Pankin left for a memorial complex to Nazi victims, Yad Vashem. Six million Jews were murdered by Nazis during World War II.

Gorbachev To Attend Peace Conference

LD1710230391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Oct 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer Yuriy Rostov] Boris Pankin, USSR minister for foreign affairs, flew to Israel today. He is then to visit other Near East countries. During the visit, it is expected that diplomatic relations with Israel will be restored.

[Correspondent V. Vinogradov] In an interview for the "Vesti" program, Boris Pankin made the following remarks:

[Begin Pankin recording] Before my departure, I spoke to Mikhail Sergeyevich, and he made his parting remarks to me. Among these he said, quite naturally, if the conference does take place—and we are hoping for this—then he is of course intending to take part in its opening, as was planned. We believe that President Bush is planning to do exactly the same. If they do meet, then they will probably find the time to discuss other issues, for example, their joint initiatives in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. [end recording]

'Considerable Progress' Noted

LD1710230191 Moscow TASS in English 2205 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By special correspondents Aleksandr Zhudro and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Tel Aviv, October 17 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin's visit to Israel began today with the first round of talks with his Israeli counterpart, David Levi.

The following joint statement was issued after their meeting:

"A wide range of matters of mutual interest to the two sides were discussed during the two ministers' meeting which was held in a frank and constructive atmosphere.

"In particular, they had a detailed exchange of views on the situation in the region and on the activation of the Middle East peace process.

"The two ministers considered Soviet-Israeli bilateral relations, including an issue concerning full restoration of diplomatic relations. They agreed that the discussion of the issue would be continued on Friday, October 18, in the same constructive spirit".

The talks continued for more than two hours. According to a source close to the Soviet foreign minister, during the talks in Jerusalem, the two sides pointed out considerable progress made in the development of relations between the two countries, and emphasised good prospects for further deepening them.

The Israeli side suggested setting up a joint commission to coordinate bilateral relations in various fields. Within this context, Levi suggested in particular that the Soviet Union draw on the experience of the Israeli economy's transition to market-determined relations.

When discussing the situation in the Middle East and matters concerning a Middle East peace conference, the two foreign ministers underlined the crucial nature of the present moment, stating that lack of further progress could lead to undesirable, negative consequences, the source said.

The two sides also discussed the role of co-chairmen of a Middle East peace conferecne, emphasising the responsible and labour-consuming character of this role, the source added.

Interviewed by DIE PRESSE

LD1810105291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 18 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna, 18 Oct (TASS)— Boris Pankin, USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is currently on a working trip to a number of countries in the region with the aim of completing preparations for a Near East conference, sees the forthcoming forum as "a major historic chance." In an interview carried in Austria's DIE PRESSE today, he emphasized the pressing need to "restore lasting peace and good-neighborliness in the Near East."

B. Pankin noted the importance of solving all problems of substance in such a way as to suit all those taking part in the Near East conference. Bringing to mind USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting in Moscow with the presidents of Serbia and Croatia, after which the Yugoslav politicians "were in quite a different frame of mind," the head of Soviet diplomacy expressed the hope that good results might be achieved by means of dialogue. In his opinion, talks are "the best means of solving problems in our complex and contradictory world."

Touching upon the positions of the USSR and the United States on a Near East settlement, the minister stressed that "essentially, we hold one and the same point of view on this question." That is "to promote a settlement to the Near East conflict and the convocation of a peace conference."

B. Pankin said that if a conference is held Mikhail Gorbachev would like to take part in its opening, noting that he expects the same from U.S. President George Bush. The Soviet minister did not rule out the fact that if both presidents were to meet they "will surely find time to discuss other issues, too." These would include, first and foremost, "a joint initiative on disarmament in the sphere of nuclear and conventional armaments."

Levi Hosts Dinner

LD1810022991 Moscow TASS in English
2249 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tel-Aviv October 18 TASS—Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi on Thursday [17 October] gave dinner in honour of his Soviet counterpart Boris Pankin.

Levi praised the results of the first round of Soviet-Israeli talks held in the Israeli capital on Thursday in a constructive and friendly atmosphere.

He said both sides focused on the Middle East settlement to achieve a lasting peace in the region.

Pankin said the radical change of the situation in the region and the whole world has boosted relations between the Soviet Union and Israel. He reiterated the Soviet Union's readiness to bring bilateral relations to a new level to the benefit of Soviet and Israeli people.

Diplomatic Relations Restored

LD1810140591 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1344 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Jerusalem, 18 Oct (TASS)—Israel and the Soviet Union today signed an agreement on the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries, an official statement by the Israeli Foreign Ministry says. The agreement was signed by USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin and Israeli Foreign Minister D. Levi.

The USSR broke off diplomatic relations with Israel over 24 years ago, on 10 June 1967, following the start of the "Six-Day War" between Israel, on the one hand, and Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, on the other.

Consular groups representing the two countries' interests, transformed into consulates general at the end of last year, have been operating recently in Moscow and Tel Aviv.

Diplomatic relations have been restored at a time when prospects have taken shape for convening in the near future an international conference on the Middle East.

Upcoming Syria Visit Previewed

LD1710181891 Moscow TASS in English
1525 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, October 17 TASS—The principal aim of Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin's forthcoming visit to the Syrian Arab Republic is to discuss problems connected with prospects for the convocation of a Middle East peace conference, as well as matters aimed at promoting a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the region, a high official of the Soviet Foreign Ministry told TASS here today.

Speaking about the stands of the Soviet Union and Syria on the Mideast peace process, the official pointed to a "broad spectrum of the coincidence of their viewpoints on the content of the Mideast peace process". The Soviet Union highly appreciates the Syrian leadership's decision to participate in a Mideast conference, the diplomat added.

Touching upon Soviet-Syrian cooperation as a whole, the ministry official said the two countries had been maintaining close friendly relations for several decades now and developing versatile cooperation in various fields.

Cooperative action in the political sphere figures importantly in bilateral relations, he said. The two countries maintain close political contacts at various levels, primarily, between the leaders of the two countries—President Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union and President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria—which makes it possible to compare the two sides' positions on various matters of mutual interest.

Having expressed satisfaction with the development of political, economic, scientific and cultural Soviet-Syrian relations, the diplomat pointed out that active work is now in progress to elevate cooperation to a higher, mutually beneficial stage.

Reportage on Pankin's Visit

WA1710190291

For reportage on the visit by Soviet Foreign Minister B.D. Pankin to Israel, please see the Israel section of the 18 October Near East & South Asia DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Israeli Business Delegation Signs Agreement

PM1510135191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[R. Lynev article: "Soviet-Israeli Economic Relations Resume After 25 Years"]

[Text] Of late a foreign economic bias has been more and more clearly visible in the activity of the USSR Science and Industry Union. It was only a day after intensive talks on cooperation between the Science and Industry Union and the Confederation of Italian Industrialists that an impressive group of representatives from the Association of Israeli Industrialists arrived in Moscow headed by this economic organization's 55-year-old president, D. Lautman, a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The aim of the Israeli businessmen's week-long stay in the USSR, which is to include talks with the Russian leadership, the leadership of the Interrepublic Economic Committee, and, needless to say, the USSR Science and Industry Union, is to discuss the prospects and outline ways for Soviet-Israeli economic relations. I must note that the Association of Israeli Industrialists represents the private, public, and kibbutz sectors of Israeli industry and includes 1,100 of the country's enterprises providing more than 80 percent of its industrial production and exports.

It is also important that businessmen and commercial people are not waiting around today, despite the fact that full diplomatic relations have still not been resumed between the USSR and Israel. As our correspondent V. Oliyanchuk wrote in a recent edition of IZVESTIYA, announcing the start of charter flights between Mineralnyye Vody and Tel Aviv, commerce outstrips diplomacy. This trend is also confirmed by a number of Soviet-Israeli projects already under way in Uzbekistan and Krasnodar Kray. Around 200 Soviet-Israeli joint ventures are currently at work. It is also interesting that 200 USSR emigres to Israel have recently returned to the Soviet Union and engaged in entrepreneurial activity.

A cooperation agreement has been signed by the Association of Israeli Industrialists and the USSR Science and Industry Union defining such fundamental areas of work as aid in establishing direct contacts between the two countries' enterprises and the regular exchange of economic and legal information, including exchange of experience of privatizing state-sector enterprises and transforming a planned economy into a market economy. Specialized delegations will arrive in the USSR in the near future from Israel to implement the terms of this agreement.

Speaking of the prospects opened up by the agreement, D. Lautman remarked at a meeting with journalists that the transitional period that the USSR is experiencing is difficult not only for Soviet business people but also for their foreign partners. Nevertheless we have no intention of biding our time, he stressed. When they meet, business people can always find a common language regardless of the structures that they represent and forms of ownership. He also voiced the idea that the Israeli approach to resolving a number of economic problems, notable for its greater flexibility in comparison with the U.S. approach, may prove more acceptable and productive in reforming the Soviet economy. We are even faced with a problem like conversion that occasionally seems insoluble, D. Lautman recalled.

Baker's Talks in Damascus Assessed

PM1710150791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[By correspondent M. Kozhevnikov: "United States-Syria: Has Agreement Been Reached? On the Near East Conference"]

[Text] Damascus—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's third stopover on his Near East tour was Damascus, where he spent over a day.

This time his talks with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad were held in three stages. The first meeting lasted almost four hours and was unexpectedly interrupted in the middle of the day. Afterwards Baker and his team returned to the Sheraton Hotel, where he usually stays when in the Syrian capital. Journalists who assembled in one of the hotel's large rooms fitted out as a news center immediately concluded that things are not going entirely smoothly at the talks.

At one point it seemed that the apparently resolved question of convening an international conference was in the air once more. The situation was somewhat clarified by a report from the Syrian president's palace. Essentially it said that the sides in the negotiations had decided to break off the talks so as to give the experts another opportunity to hone the text of the U.S. "message on guarantees," which apparently did not entirely suit the Syrians. It was also learned that the recess was used to agree to the precise content of the invitation to the conference addressed to Damascus.

Did Al-Asad and Baker finally manage to agree on all the questions after the three rounds of meetings? The meager information available does not make it possible to draw a confident conclusion on that score. Observers agree that Syria seems to have agreed to take part in the conference, although it continues to insist on the need for Washington to exert weighty pressure on Israel. Damascus still believes that a settlement in the region must be based on UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, in other words, on the principle of "peace in exchange for land."

In conversations with me, Western journalists close to the U.S. delegation expressed understanding for the Syrians' position. In their view, Syria may agree even to bilateral talks with the Israelis within the framework of the peace conference so long as it receives from the United States a firm guarantee that the Golan Heights will be returned to it and that other occupied Arab territories will be released. Tel Aviv, for its part, categorically refuses to satisfy those demands. This is causing a natural skepticism about the expediency of the conference among the Syrians.

Meanwhile, in other Arab capitals, active preparations for the international peace forum are continuing. In Amman King Husayn of Jordan received a delegation of Palestinians from the occupied Arab lands headed by F. al-Husayni. It is reported that the discussion at this meeting was on the formation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.

According to information from Palestinian sources, a delegation from the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine is in Paris now. It is making contacts with representatives of the French Foreign Ministry as well as with leaders of the Socialist Party. The Palestinians are trying to persuade Paris to use its prestige in the international arena and work together with other EC countries to support the PLO at this difficult stage in the talks for it.

Meanwhile, by decision of the Israeli authorities, Jerusalem is closed to Arabs from the West Bank. This measure was adopted on the eve of J. Baker's forthcoming meeting there with USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin. Heightened security measures will be adopted over most of the territory of Jerusalem to prevent terrorist acts and mass anti-Israeli actions by Palestinians.

U.S. Neutrality as Mideast Mediator Doubted

PM1510105891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 91 p 4

[Correspondent V. Belyakov article: "Is the Intermediary Neutral?"]

[Text] Cairo—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker is back in the Near East. This is his eighth trip to the region this year. Baker's itinerary takes in Egypt, Israel, Syria, and Jordan. The objective is still the same: to prepare for the convocation of a peace conference.

During the last trip, which was in mid-September, the secretary of state presented each of the potential participants in the talks with a memorandum setting forth the U.S. approach to the convocation and running of the conference. These documents were not, of course, intended for the press. But because of their importance journalists did everything possible to get access to them. Not without success.

First the Egyptian press published the memorandum presented by Baker to a delegation of Palestinians from the occupied territories (PRAVDA wrote about this 28 September). On the eve of the present trip the Saudi newspaper AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT printed the text of the memorandum presented by Baker to the Israeli Government. This document undoubtedly merits attention, especially since it differs from the one presented to the Palestinians.

Each side, the document notes, is entitled to its own interpretation of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Israel, as Prime Minister I. Shamir's recent statement once again indicates, believes that Resolution 242 of 22 November 1967 does not oblige it to leave the occupied territories, while the Arabs take the opposite view. For reference, let me quote this resolution from the official Russian UN text: "1) withdrawal of Israeli Armed Forces from territories occupied during the recent conflict."

The U.S. position on Jerusalem amounts to saying that the city is indivisible and its status should be defined by means of talks. Let me remind you that before the 1967 Israeli aggression, Jerusalem, where holy places of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are located, was divided between Israel and Jordan. Soon after the aggression in summer 1967, Israel formally annexed Arab East Jerusalem, and in 1980 declared the forcibly united city to be its "eternal and indivisible capital." Both acts were rejected by the Security Council. Its Resolution 478 of 20 August 1980 on the question of Jerusalem noted that they "are invalid and should be immediately revoked."

The United States, the document goes on to say, recognizes the legitimacy of Israel's concern for its security and the importance that Israel attaches to the Golan Heights in this connection. This territory, which belongs to Syria, was also occupied in 1967, and later, like East Jerusalem, formally annexed by Israel, and this was also deemed unlawful by the Security Council at the time.

In short, on territorial questions the United States is much closer to the aggressor than to its victims. The reader can, of course, judge for himself how far this position coincides with international legality as expressed in Security Council decisions.

The United States, like Israel, rejects the creation of an independent Palestinian state, as is stated frankly in the document. Incidentally, a decision on this was adopted by the UN General Assembly back in 1947—the very same decision on the basis of which Israel was created a year later. It has been repeatedly reaffirmed since 1974, at the request of the Palestinians.

And indeed, what is this desire to tell other people how they should live? The question of whether there should or should not be an independent Palestinian state is within the competence of the Palestinians alone, who, like any other people, have the inalienable right to self-determination. I think this question should now be clearer to us than ever.

It is noteworthy that none of these points from the memorandum conveyed to Israel was to be found in the analogous document handed to the Palestinians.

I am not saying that the U.S. and Israeli positions coincide entirely. There are differences between them. But I would venture to assert that the differences are secondary. So if the Americans do succeed in convening a peace conference—and its fate will undoubtedly be clarified to some extent by Baker's trip—the possible outcome, given such an intermediary, is unlikely to provoke optimism in anyone who wishes the Near East a just and therefore lasting peace.

East Europe

More on Croatian, Serbian Leaders' Talks

PM1710175591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[By Yu. Tavrovskiy and G. Charodeyev: "Moscow Communique Adopted. Crisis in Yugoslavia Continues"]

[Text] Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic and Croatian leader Franjo Tudjman spent just 24 hours in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR president. The chief result of their visit was a trilateral communique, adopted with M. Gorbachev's mediation, that charts a way to overcome the bloody crisis in Yugoslavia.

Journalists accredited in Moscow were kept in the dark about the program for the high-ranking guests' visit for quite a long time. At midday, however, President S. Milosevic held a briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. Speaking about the Soviet president's role in settling the Yugoslav crisis, he declared that, compared with other European leaders, Mikhail Gorbachev has a clearer picture of the situation.

Replying to a question from Soviet correspondents, the Serbian president declared that the republic's leadership regards Yugoslavia as a unified state of equal peoples, ethnic groups, and republics "based on a market economy and multiparty parliamentary democracy."

S. Milosevic reported on his meeting with Russian President B. Yeltsin, to whom he conveyed an invitation to visit Serbia. The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president in turn proposed signing a long-term agreement on economic ties and cooperation between Russia and Serbia.

IZVESTIYA's correspondent has learned that at the end of his meeting with B. Yeltsin in the White House, the Croatian leader granted a brief interview to Soviet journalists. "We believe," he declared, "that Boris Yeltsin can make a weighty contribution to resolving the conflict and ending the war in Croatia." The Russian president, F. Tudjman reported, supported Zagreb's initiative for the creation of a Russian-Croatian commission for questions of economic cooperation.

The Croatian leader was skeptical about the possibility of starting talks between Serbia and Croatia in the very near future. "If that were possible, then Europe would not have had to tackle the problem." He said that Croatia is "struggling against the restoration of communism." He asserted that "the Yugoslav Army, headed by Communist generals struggling against democracy in Croatia, was directly linked with the putschists in the USSR." F. Tudjman declared that these "Communist generals received written instructions from the Soviet Army's Main Political Directorate at the beginning of this year."

On the evening of 16 October F. Tudjman had a meeting with E. Shevardnadze. During the talks the frightening similarity of the political processes in post-Communist Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union was pointed out. "The war in Yugoslavia has destroyed the possibility of preserving the political union, leaving only a chance of economic ties among the former republics, and even then only if a rapid end to combat operations is reached, further casualties and destruction are avoided, and the war does not spread to neighboring republics," F. Tudjman pointed out.

F. Tudjman spoke hopefully of M. Gorbachev's peacemaking initiative and of the weight of B. Yeltsin's authority. However, in the situation that has taken shape, in his opinion, an independent politician, known throughout the world for his democratic convictions, has more chances of success. Therefore, according to F. Tudjman, a visit by E. Shevardnadze to Croatia could make a major contribution to resolving the conflict.

Foreign Ministry Cautious on Results

OW1810104391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
0737 GMT 18 Oct 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR Foreign Ministry is cautious in its assessment of the outcome of talks held in Moscow with the Serbian and Croatian leaders with M. Gorbachev's mediation. It's hard to say whether the conflicting sides will enter into a dialogue within a month in accordance with the communique signed by Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman, and whether this will lead to gaining a more or less stable truce, DP's [DIPLOMATIC PANORAM] correspondent was told at the 3rd European Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. At the moment, importance is attached to the very fact that the two leaders agreed to come to Moscow and confer with the USSR president, a diplomat said.

According to him, the atmosphere of these meetings was on the whole normal, and "no political importance should be attached" to the Croatian leader's refusal to give a news conference right after yesterday's news conference given by the Serbian leader. Soviet Foreign Ministry officials do not believe that by undertaking mediatory functions M. Gorbachev wished to snatch initiative from the European Community or other states and politicians engaged in seeking to reach a settlement in Yugoslavia. His initiative was launched in the framework of the CSCE process and commitments made by the USSR with a view to strengthening security in Europe.

Foreign Ministry: No Comment on Coup

OW1810110891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0737 GMT 18 Oct 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Ministry declined to comment on what Franjo Tudjman said about links between the State-of-Emergency Committee, on the one hand, and the "communist leadership" of Yugoslavia and the command of the Yugoslav People's Army (YPA), on the other, during August's coup in the USSR. The Croatian leader told newsmen after his meeting with Boris Yeltsin on Wednesday that what is happening in Yugoslavia today can be qualified as "an attempt to restore communism." According to him, senior YPA officers were "directly connected with the State-of-Emergency Committee and received "written instructions" directly from political departments of the Soviet Armed Forces.

"I don't know where Franjo Tudjman gets his information," a diplomat said. When DP's [DIPLOMATIC PANORAMA] correspondent got in touch with the press service of the Soviet Defence Ministry, its members denied the Main Political Department's involvement in the events in Yugoslavia. According to information obtained from the Soviet Defence Ministry, "to send instructions to the YPA was beyond the Main Political Department's competence."

At his meeting with newsmen on Wednesday Slobodan Milosevic categorically dismissed the allegations that Serbia had supported the coup in the USSR. According to him, it was Serbia which made a statement through its foreign minister to condemn the use of violence in the USSR and thus became "the only republic in Yugoslavia to show a negative attitude to the coup."

Nevertheless the fog was not dispelled, and some of the reporters who awaited Franjo Tudiman in vain at the press center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry came to believe that because of his cancelled news conference, they missed the opportunity to find out whether the Croatian leader could mention concrete facts testifying to Soviet-Yugoslav links during the coup.

Judging by what reporters accredited at the Soviet Foreign Ministry said, some of them are inclined to believe that participants in the coup in the USSR tried to exert influence on developments in Yugoslavia. To substantiate their belief they referred to Soviet press reports on connections between the conspirators and certain circles in Bulgaria, Romania, and Cuba.

A Soviet journalist who knows Yugoslavia well has told DP's correspondent that much has to be clarified yet. According to him, it's worthwhile to analyse the true meaning of active contacts the former Soviet Premier Valentin Pavlov had with the Yugoslav leadership at the time preceding the August coup. Reporters who covered Soviet-Yugoslav meetings at that time still don't know concretely what questions were raised during those meetings, since no progress has been made to this day in the development of trade and economic ties between the two countries. The journalist preferred to remain anonymous because he intends to go to Yugoslavia in the near future.

Defense Ministry Denies Coup Link

OW1610192591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1700 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The press-service of the Soviet Defence Ministry has denied today, Wednesday [16 October], reports that during the failed coup in the Soviet Union its Chief Political Department gave any instructions to the Yugoslav People's Army. To a question by INTERFAX, the ministry's spokesman said the department had no function of channelling any instructions abroad.

The report on such a link followed from the statement in Moscow on the same day by Croatia's President Franjo Tudjman who alleged that on August 19-21 the communist leadership of Yugoslavia supported the action by the putsch organizers in the USSR and the army commandment "had instructions directly from the Political Department of the Soviet Armed Forces."

Romanians Demand Free Passage to Finland

OW1610192691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1700 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] About 250 Romanian citizens began a series of rallies and hunger strikes on Wednesday [16 October] morning in the Vyborg District, Leningrad region, bordering on Finland. They demand that the Finnish authorities should immediately admit them to Finland as political refugees.

St. Petersburg the protesters are ready to block the motor road and rail link between Petersburg-Helsinki. [sentence as received]

Our correspondent was told by Finland's Consul General in St. Petersburg Markus Liura that his country's Foreign Ministry has begun urgent consultations concerning those demands. So far, no grounds have been found for granting them political refugees' status. He had requested the authorities of the north-western Soviet region bordering on Finland to prevent the Romanian citizens invading the area on the other side of the border.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry's spokesmen in St. Petersburg explains that those Romanian had arrived in the Leningrad region under the no-visa regime between the USSR and Romania.

Continue Rally on Soviet-Finnish Border

LD1610180791 Moscow TASS in English
1710 GMT 16 Oct 91

[By correspondent Lev Frolov]

[Text] St. Petersburg October 16 TASS—One hundred and fifty Romanian refugees have been rallying for almost a week on the Soviet-Finnish border in Vyborg, near St. Petersburg.

They are trying to leave the Soviet Union for Finland, but the Finnish authorities have flatly refused to grant them entrance visas.

The conflict began on October 11, when the first group of refugees came to Vyborg by a Moscow-Helsinki train, Deputy Chairman of the Vyborg City Council Vladimir Bystrov told TASS.

Soviet border guards offered the Romanians to stay in the Soviet Union for a while, since they do not have Finnish visas. In response, they organised a rally near the city council, which has continued until now.

The Romanians do not accept humanitarian aid from the Soviet authorities and refuse to go back to St. Petersburg, Bystrov said. He noted, however, that, despite the complicated and extraordinary situation, the refugees have no claims on the Soviet authorities. Representatives of the Finnish Consulate General from Saint Petersburg are conducting negotiations with them.

Commenting on the current situation, Finnish Consul General in St. Petersburg Markus Lyra told TASS there are tens of thousands of jobless in Finland and it is hardly expedient to aggravate this problem.

Finland Refuses Visas

OW1710040991 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1730 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Eija Kauppi, First Secretary of the Finnish Embassy in Tallinn, told BF [BALTFAX] that the Finnish authorities would not grant entrance visas and job permissions to 160 Romanians who had come to Tallinn over a week ago. Mr. Kauppi explained that in order to get permission to work in Finland one should present an application from an employer.

A BF correspondent reports from Tallinn that the Romanians willing to go to Finland via the Estonian capital all that time have been living before the Finnish Embassy in one of the city's main streets.

However, the Romanians did not leave the street even after they learned about the decision of the Finnish authorities.

According to Raik Saart, the Tallinn Police prefect, the police are watching the Romanians but cannot undertake any action because they do not violate public order.

Estonian Justice Minister Juri Raidla told BF that "the incident with the Romanians has shown what may happen if Estonia's eastern border remains open."

Under the present Estonian legislation, authorities have the right to demand from newcomers residence permissions and to expel them after one month spent in Estonia.

A few days ago the Estonian Foreign Ministry asked the Romanian authorities for help in settling the incident. However, it has not yet received any response.

Last week the 160 Romanians requested that the Estonian Red Cross promote the issuing of documents necessary for them to enter Finland. But a Red Cross spokesman told BF that his organization has not enough means even to provide the Romanians with food and shelter.

New East European Cooperation Group Detailed

PM1710110191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Oct 91 Union Edition p 7

[By S. Mushkaterov: "EECT [East European Cooperation and Trade] Is Not a New CEMA, One of the Leaders of the 'East European Cooperation and Trade' Organization Affirms"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA (No. 241) has already briefly reported, a session of the coordination committee of the "East European Cooperation and Trade" [EECT] international organization has been held in Moscow. Our correspondent asked Aleksandr Mazanov, EECT deputy general director, to provide more detailed information about the new organization.

According to him, almost 30 firms, joint-stock companies, and other organizations from the USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary have already agreed to become the founders of EECT. And their number is growing.

What is the new organization's aim? It is no secret that the elimination of CEMA and the switch in mutual settlements among its former members to freely convertible currency—of which it very soon emerged they did not have enough—have led to a fall in commodity turnover and the emergence of many other problems. These negative trends have primarily affected relations between the East European countries and the now sovereign states on the Soviet Union's territory. If you bear in mind the fact that the West does not particularly need the goods produced by the former CEMA members, then they are virtually "doomed" to trade among themselves. But in order to restore the broken ties on a market basis, they must introduce fundamentally new mechanisms for the organization of commodity exchange.

Therefore, A. Mazanov said, a group of businessmen, in conjunction with American specialists, took the model used in the United States in clearing operations on the stock exchange and created their own model that could work in the countries of the former socialist camp. In brief, this stock exchange and banking mechanism will enable the manufacturer to market his goods, obtain credit for these goods at the clearing bank in the form of foreign currency certificates, and consequently buy what he needs. A transition to settlements in hard currency will gradually be implemented. The EECT will have commercial structures for this purpose: the East European Exchange and the International Clearing Bank with subsidiaries in the different countries, and trading houses.

There is another aspect on which my interlocutor focused attention. In no case is the EECT playing the part of a kind of legal successor to CEMA, nor does it want to do so. "We have a fundamentally new approach. We will not have any treaties here, everything goes onto the market. CEMA was a bureaucratic organization, whereas ours is a market one," A. Mazanov stressed.

West Europe

Presidential Press Service on Erich Honecker

OW1710121891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The humanitarian aspect must be taken into account in the case of Erich Honecker, said a member of the USSR president's press service. "One shouldn't forget that this involves an elderly man who should be treated accordingly", he added.

The spokesman for the USSR president's press service gave a negative reply to the question of IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent as to whether or not some efforts were made to decide Erich Honecker's destiny. "This issue should be resolved by Erich Honecker himself", he said. Prior to this the USSR Foreign Ministry denied its involvement in the endeavours to decide the destiny of the former GDR leader.

The former GDR leader is facing the following difficulty: Unlike his wife Margot who received a German passport and visited their daughter in Chile, he has no such document. He failed to enter into contact with the German embassy since the German authorities are insisting on his arrest. IF's correspondent learned from the Chilean Embassy in Moscow that so far the Chilean authorities are willing to grant a permit for residence in their country only to Margot Honecker who has a German passport. As for Erich Honecker, he will be granted such a permit only when he receives a passport and settles his legal affairs in Germany.

Mitterrand, Kohl Propose European Army

PM1710152591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 p 4

[A. Boldinyuk article: "New Role for Europe? Paris and Bonn Advocate Creation of United Army"]

[Text] According to news agency reports, French President Francois Mitterrand and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl have proposed a joint initiative concerning a new role for the EC. The leaders of the two largest EC countries have proposed setting up a European army and transferring control over international affairs to the EC—primarily regarding EC members' relations with the United States, the USSR, and the East European and Near East states.

The Mitterrand and Kohl proposals, which have been submitted to their EC partners, essentially mean that Paris and Bonn are striving to create a full-fledged union of Old World countries. The steps taken by the two countries' leaders, who are known for their commitment to the idea of general European unity, are particularly topical in connection with the approach of 1992, when there will be virtually no barriers left between the EC countries.

Observers' attention has been particularly drawn to the idea of setting up a European army, which could be based on a 50,000-strong Franco-German corps. It is well known that the two countries currently have a joint army brigade. The Mitterrand and Kohl proposals note that the "Western European Union should become the EC's defense component."

Foreseeing a possibly negative reaction from their NATO partners—primarily the United States—Paris and Bonn are proposing that a future European army will be "transparent." This means that NATO will take part in the decisionmaking process as regards European defense.

In the words of a French presidential spokesman, the Mitterrand and Kohl initiatives are aimed at "giving new impetus to the joint international and defense policy that will be the nucleus of any future treaty on political union." It can be assumed that in general the reaction to the French and German leaders' proposal from the other EC members—with the exception of Britain—will be positive. London is striving for closer ties between European structures and NATO and the United States and is unlikely to agree in the foreseeable future to transferring control of its own foreign policy affairs to EC organs.

As for the military sphere, the Paris and Bonn initiative will probably be discussed at the NATO Nuclear Planning Group session, which is opening in Sicily.

Gorbachev Greets German Twin Towns Congress

LD1310102991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2106 GMT 12 Oct 91

[Text] Biberach an der Riss, 12 Oct (TASS)—A ceremonial mass in St. Martin's Cathedral officially opened the third congress of USSR and German twin towns in Biberach an der Riss. The USSR ambassador to Germany read out greetings sent to the congress participants by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. "The twin towns movement has done much in deepening our mutual understanding and bringing our people closer together and has had its own input into the reconcilition process," the greeting notes. "It faces great practical tasks connected to people's everyday interests. It enjoys moral authority in both countries, and in this lies the pledge of its vitality."

Latin America & Caribbean

Talks on Monitoring Station in Cuba Confirmed

PM1510075591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[From REUTER, AP, AFP, UPI roundup under the "IZVESTIYA Teletype Room" rubric: "Soviet Specialists To Leave Cuba?"]

[Text] A highly placed member of the Soviet military has confirmed in Washington that the USSR intends to hold consultations with Cuba on the question of a gradual withdrawal from the country of around 2,500 technical personnel maintaining a Soviet electronic monitoring station not far from Havana.

Castro Sees 'No Alternative to Revolution'

PM1610143591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 91 Union Edition p 7

[By A. Kamorin: "Why Communists Do Not Need Witnesses. The Fourth Congress of the Cuban Communist Party Has Started Its Work Behind Firmly Closed Doors"]

[Text] It was known in advance that the routine congress of the Cuban Communists would be of an "internal" nature, or to put it more simply, that it would take place behind closed doors. Not many people, however, supposed that those doors would be closed so firmly. It was expected that at least the beginning of the first session, including Fidel Castro's speech, would be shown live on Cuban television.

To the astonishment of both Cubans and foreign observers, on Thursday morning you could only see the beginning of the session, the part purely devoted to protocol. The rest of the time allocated to broadcasting the congress in the television schedule was filled with music and documentaries.

As usual, the lack of information served as food for rumors. The subject that is perhaps being discussed most actively is the absence from the auditorium of the "Heredia" theater in Santiago, where the forum is being held, of Raul Castro, Interior Minister Abelardo Colome Ibarra, and many top military chiefs. According to the official version read out at the congress, this is because of the need to adopt special measures to ensure the country's security. That is probably the case, but in light of the rumors being actively discussed in the Western press about differences of opinion between the Castro brothers, the emergence of a new series of conjectures on the subject is obviously inevitable.

It was only late in the evening that the television broadcast a recording of F. Castro's speech. And, once again disappointing people's hopes, the Cuban leader made a speech lasting over four hours on loose themes instead of the usual party congress keynote report.

Castro warned the audience that they would hear the main speech after the forum had ended. Indeed, that speech did not contain any particularly important positions not already expressed by the supreme commander in chief in previous speeches; in any event, the section that concerned Cuba did not. Perhaps the most important thesis for everyone expecting some kind of "new line" in Cuban policy to be announced at the congress were F. Castro's words to the effect that there is no alternative to revolution in that country and that, if there are people who think otherwise, they should eradicate such thoughts.

It is another matter that the Cuban leader devoted a very extensive part of his speech to an analysis of the broad spectrum of the USSR's problems, ranging from the state of affairs in bilateral trade to the investigation of our leadership's mistakes on the eve of the Great Patriotic War. I think that these utterances merit a separate discussion, particularly since the broadcast of the speech has only just come to an end as I transmit these lines, and there is no official text yet. I will only note that Castro expressed his negative attitude to recent changes in the Soviet Union openly, particularly as regards the CPSU's position. The speaker noted that he had warned of the possibility of such a turn of events a long time ago, although the initial phase of our reforms, the ideas of improving socialism and concrete measures such as the campaign against alcoholism and unearned income, looked quite attractive, in his opinion.

So far nothing has been reported about progress in the discussion of the first point on the agenda—the resolution on introducing changes into the party statutes.

I think that it was the secrecy surrounding the congress that provoked government opponents to try to fill the vacuum of opinions that had formed in the past few days. At a meeting with journalists in Havana on

Monday, several dissident groups, mainly of a human rights bent united in the "Cuban Democratic Accord" organization, published an appeal to the forum's delegates. Strictly speaking, the proposals put forward in this document are not new either, and this is not the first time that the dissidents have made them public. They concern, first of all, an amnesty for all political prisoners and the repeal of the Article Five of the Constitution enshrining the Communist Party's leading role. Recognition of illegal political and religious organizations and reconciliation with Cuban emigres abroad were also recommended. Figuring among the concrete measures were the calling of a nationwide "roundtable" with the participation of all interested parties and the holding of universal direct and secret elections to all organs of legislative and executive power.

I doubt, however, that these appeals will be heard. The tiny dissidents' groups and the huge Cuban Communist Party exist as if in different dimensions, which do not intersect anywhere in this country's conditions. The party controls Cuba's fate. The congress will determine the party's own fate.

Results of 4th Cuban Congress Summarized

PM1810081191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 p 4

[By correspondent A. Moiseyev: "With Optimism, Not Changing Course... Fourth Communist Party of Cuba Congress Closes"]

[Text] Havana—The Fourth Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Congress, which was held behind closed doors, has ended in Santiago de Cuba. It has already been called by its delegates a historic event and the forum of the "special period." For five days Communists representing the more than 600,000-strong party discussed society's urgent problems. The main result of the discussions was that the party will continue to lead the country "forward with optimism, not changing course."

The congress approved four resolutions, which envisage certain changes to the party statutes and program, the structure of people's power, and covering the republic's economic development. During a wide-ranging analysis of the international situation, special emphasis was placed on the negative consequences for the island of the radical changes that have taken place in the countries of East Europe and the Soviet Union, which had been a reliable support for Cuba for many years. It is worth noting that the party forum constantly pointed to the damage done to the revolution by the many years of copying "foreign experience." At the same time, the "Cuban concept of socialism"—which was termed by delegates the most humane, fair, and democratic in the world—was extolled.

Cuban Communists unanimously advocated retaining the anti-imperialist and internationalist thrust of their country's foreign policy, and spoke in favor of the principles of respect, sovereignty, and each nation's right to self-determination.

The resolution on changes to the PCC statutes confirmed that this political organization will continue to be the sole leading and guiding force for the Cuban people, guided by the ideas of Marti, Marx, and Lenin, and that building socialism will remain the revolution's supreme aim. The forum categorically ruled out the slightest possibility of a multiparty system being created in the country, and gave a "resolute rebuff to the manifestations of capitalism and the lauding of bourgeois ideology and petit bourgeois individualism."

Moreover, the delegates resolved to show combat spirit, oppose pessimistic sentiments and distrust of socialism, and put a stop to criminal antisocial activity. The party congress declared merciless war not only on the economic crime that has permeated society, but also on any dissidence.

Among the most important changes to the party statutes, one can note the abolition of the posts of Central Committee secretaries and the status of candidate members of PCC leading organs. An amendment has also been made permitting people practicing any religion to join the organization.

The congress approved a resolution on the party program, and although it was recognized as being out of line with the new realities, its content was not changed in any way. The new Central Committee of 225 members—more than half of whom, as was previously announced, have been renewed—has been tasked with reviewing the program. Moreover, the delegates passed a resolution instructing the forthcoming National Assembly session of the country's people's power to make a number of changes to the electoral system. Thus, for the first time, organs of power at national and provincial level will be shaped as a result of a direct vote by the population. Previously only municipal assembly deputies had been elected in this way.

The most acute debate at the forum centered on economic questions—above all, the subject of agriculture. Proposals to introduce free peasant markets in the country were categorically rejected. They have already been introduced twice and banned twice, because they allowed a section of the population to become excessively rich, the congress speakers said. A third attempt would be impermissible. The final word on this problem was had by Fidel Castro himself, stating that peasant markets are harmful for Cuba, because the small private farms that militate for them have never resolved the food problem—nor would they be able to. Looking at the big picture, the party congress rejected any partial, and especially any radical, changes to the national economic model, firmly rejecting private initiative, too.

The forum's decisions show that the PCC has no intention to backtrack from the political and economic course that the country is being set by its leaders headed by

Fidel Castro. The unchanging helmsman, who was referred to in one of the resolutions as "Cuba's historic leader," was lauded at every forum session with epithets and toasts. Delegates called on ordinary Cubans to be conscientious, to strengthen discipline, and to work better and more doggedly. They were also exhorted to prepare for even sterner tests and for the coming difficulties of the "special period." In the opinion of local observers, the nation's slogan—"Socialism or Death!"—may perhaps acquire more dramatic meaning on the island.

Moscow Spanish Analyzes Results

PY1710005091 Moscow Radio Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Leonid Levchenko commentary]

[Text] Good evening, dear listeners. The five days of work for the Cuban Communists' forum are over. The congress expressed the party's determination to refuse to retreat a single step on the principles of Cuban socialism, especially at this very difficult time for the country.

This was the predictable outcome. The Cubans will have to tighten their belts even further because of food shortages. They will also have to prepare to repel aggression from their eternal enemy: U.S. imperialism. Cubans will have to die to defend the revolution and socialism.

As is known, the congress approved several resolutions. For example, the resolution on economic development provides for practically no reform, despite the fact that the economic policy has to be modified. Though the fact that the resolution on the food problem was one of the main issues, the congress opposed operation of a free peasant market, which was forbidden in the mid-1980's.

Market (?conditions) are not in keeping with the Cuban socialist model, just as they were not in keeping with the Soviet socialist or East European models. Experience and the need to get rid of Communist dogmas have invalidated such models.

How are Cuban Communists planning to find a solution to their serious economic crisis?

They placed emphasis on the need to save power and energy resources, to improve labor discipline, and to fight corruption and theft. The Cubans will develop tourism, create joint enterprises, and attract foreign capital. As Fidel Castro put it, preference will be given to Latin American entrepreneurs in a framework of regional integration.

Promoting development will continue to be more important than meeting consumers' demands. Cubans will be given the minimum that they need to live. It remains to be seen whether this will be enough to quell the people's increasing discontent.

In response to world criticism for the lack of democracy in Cuba, the congress proposed to the National Assembly the calling of elections with direct, universal vote. Yet [words indistinct] there will be no multiparty system in Cuba, and all elective posts will be filled only to increase the party's opportunities to exercise its leading role.

This situation is very familiar to us Soviets. What great resistance we had to face from the Soviet Communist Party when we tried to abolish an article of the Constitution that granted the party a major role in society!

In its resolution on foreign policy, the congress stated that it respects the right of the USSR and East European countries to choose their own course. Yet, at the same time, they invited Soviet Communists to analyze the clumsy mistakes and causes that led to the current situation.

We also respect Cuba's right to choose its own path toward development. We would not like the Cubans to make the same clumsy mistakes and errors that we made under the totalitarian socialist regime. Like Cuba, our country is willing to build its foreign relations on the basis of mutual respect and the observance of international law.

Political & Social

Final Deliberations on Economic Agreement

Gorbachev, Yeltsin Discuss Treaty

LD1810061291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0200 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] An RIA correspondent has learned that at the meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev which took place on 17 October, a number of disputed clauses of the treaty on economic community were discussed. Discussion was engendered in particular by clauses regarding the banking system and the budgets, and with reference to chapter nine of the document, which revitalizes the Union center.

Mikhail Gorbachev accepted all the remarks made by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president, and in the course of the day made attempts to persuade the other potential treaty participants to agree with the Russian leader's remarks. Boris Yeltsin also convinced Gorbachev of the fact that the admission of new members to the economic community must be carried out with the agreement of all republics which have signed the treaty, and not with a majority of votes, as was provided for initially.

Gorbachev Meets Silayev

LD1710193191 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Thursday [17 October] met Russian Republic leader Boris Yeltsin and Soviet interim government head Ivan Silayev to discuss proposals made by Yeltsin as regards an inter-republican economic agreement to be signed on October 18.

Silayev Interviewed

LD1810093691

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 0608 GMT on 18 October carries a 12-minute live or recorded interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the committee for the operational management of the country's economy, by Valeriy Kiosa at the committee's offices in Moscow.

Kiosa recalls that the signing of the agreement on an economic community is scheduled to take place at 1700 today. Silayev says he wants to offer listeners "a ray of hope", stating: "I am convinced that the long-awaited treaty on economic community will be signed today at 1700." Kiosa asks if all 10 sovereign republics which took part in the State Council session on 11 October are going to sign this document. Silayev answers: "I am unable to give precise guarantees on whether it will be 10, or maybe 11, but, as a minimum 10 or, without fail, nine will sign. Esteemed comrades, I would not want or advise people to analyse, right after that, why someone failed to sign, or say that there is a wholesale regression again and that everything is once more in a bad way. I would even say that it will be a very good thing if eight, nine, or 10 sign. I can assure you of this, because the two months' period of joint work within the operational committee, when we worked with all the 12 republics as committee members, plus three Baltic representatives as observers, leads to the conclusion that it is possible to reach agreement, that it is possible to proceed along the most important directions in step with one another. My advice is simply not to worry, not to be concerned if, all of a sudden, one or two republics fail to sign today. They will join later on without fail, because the situation is currently like that. The whole world exemplifies the fact that without joining forces it is impossible to resolve the most important economic problems. Finally, we are all tired of fighting."

In answer to Kiosa's question about the economic treaty's impact on the situation in the country, Silayev recalls the Russian 500 days program and what it had to say about an economic union. The time has come to join efforts to fight the crisis, he says. "You will not hear any harsh or relentless criticism today of the program which is at the basis of the treaty and, moreover, the whole world is waiting: When will we, for instance, take ourselves in hand, renounce political ambitions, and unite in our economic aspirations?" The world is ready to help us, he adds, if we do that. The treaty, which comes into force the moment it is signed, is merely the first step. A great deal of work is then to be done by everyone to put things right. "The treaty is not merely a strategy for action, as it were—it is the basis of economic reforms. The basic principles are set out therein." He adds: "We shall have to sign 18 working agreements which will fill the treaty with concrete content."

Kiosa says that it was agreed at the latest State Council sitting that the elaboration of four or five basic agreements relating to the treaty would be a condition for the ratification of the treaty by the parliaments of the sovereign republics. He asks how this work is proceeding at the moment. Silayev says that the timeframe was indeed agreed upon and that the elaboration of these documents will take between a month and a month and a half. "Yesterday we reached agreement with President Gorbachev that at the next State Council session, in two weeks time, a minimum of two documents will be submitted, setting in motion the process of implementation of these conditions of ratification." Silayev adds that some parliaments may well be satisfied with three or four agreements for ratification purposes. "It is a free economic accord, an economic agreement, and it does not coerce anyone. Moreover, the agreement, the treaty, has a very important provision: The admission of new members into this community will only take place when all the members agree to it—that is to say, certain conditions will be stipulated and they will have to be fulfilled before admission to this economic community is granted."

The treaty, Silayev continues, makes provision for bringing consequences to bear on those who may violate it. It says, in particular, that "no action should be detrimental to other republics—certain economic sanctions will be consequent upon it." Kiosa thanks Silayev, who concludes the interview by urging people to look to the future with optimism.

Volskiy 'Expressed Confidence'

OW1710123291 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1130 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Arkadiy Volskiy, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Committee for the Management of the Economy, has given an interview to IF [INTERFAX] in which he expressed confidence that the treaty on an economic community would be signed on October 18, as planned. "Common sense should prevail over emotion," he said.

Mr Volskiy specially emphasised that the disintegration of the country would be disastrous.

In his opinion it is not the main point how many republics will sign the treaty on October 18, for those which do not may do so later on. What matters is that it should be signed by the "major" republics, for this would provide a kind of groundwork.

Asked what he thought of the special stance taken by the Ukraine vis-a-vis the treaty, Mr Volskiy stressed that this was the stance of the Ukrainian political leadership, which did not reflect the attitude of the population. He had been visited by leaders of some strike committees from the Donbass, and "they don't agree with the Ukrainian Government".

Speaking about Mikhail Gorbachev's future as a politician, Mr Volskiy said "he still hasn't exhausted his potential". Much depended on the forthcoming signing of the treaty, which would create a more favourable atmosphere at the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet to open on October 21. If, however, "the signing does not take place for some reason, we will have to draw appropriate conclusions," he said.

Asked whether he thought another putsch, a more serious one this time, was possible if the economic chaos continued, Mr Volskiy replied, "I don't think a new putsch is impossible." In his view, the whole problem was that there were "too many disagreements among democrats".

There was too much discord on the Kuril Islands issue as well. This was a painful and extremely serious problem, Mr Volskiy stressed, and any attempts to make extremist or rash solutions should be thwarted. His personal view was that "public opinion should realise that the problem does exist". One could not deny the fact the way it had been done for over 20 years. But he did not think Japan had taken a very reasonable stand either by linking the development of Japanese-Soviet trade with the resolution of the Kurils issue. He emphasised that the visits of Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin to Japan had provided a good basis for the discussion of it.

Council for Entrepreneurship in Favor

OW1610141191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR President's Council for entrepreneurship has backed the Economic-Community Treaty. The council's statement, circulated on Wednesday [16 October], says that such a treaty should be signed and ratified without delay.

The statement also says that "a lack of economic coordination between the republics and sovereign states, and the absence of agreement on economic reform inevitably leads to an economic and social catatsrophe".

"The process of the Soviet Union's evolution into a union of sovereign states must be aimed, above all, at improving the population's living standards, which can only be done by accelerating radical economic reforms and by putting it on a market footing," says the statement.

In connection with this statement, the council's chairman, Aleksandr Vladislavlev, told INTERFAX that "if prior to the August coup one could talk about a force hampering economic reforms, no there is no organized force slowing down restructuring". Therefore, every political leader must realize that "from now onward his activity will be judged not by the things he has destroyed—the time for destruction has gone—but by the things he has created," said Mr. Vladislavlev.

Foreign Experts Give 'Verdict'

OW1810062691 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1500 GMT 17 Oct 91

["Viewpoint" by INTERFAX economic analyst Valeriy Martyanov, from the "Business Weekly" feature: "Republics Signed an Economic Agreement. Will They Now Observe It?"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ex-republics of the USSR are getting ready to sign an agreement on an economic union whose section on eternal econonic activities does not make either political or economic sense. Such is the verdict handed down by foreign trade experts.

IF's [INTERFAX] economic analyst Valeriy Martyanov has met with two Soviet experts to find out their views.

Although the necessity for creating a common economic space is clearly enough stated in the agreement on an economic union, the agreement is extremely vague on one of the essential elements of such a space—the principle of a customs union, maintain a foreign trade expert Maksim Medvedkov.

We are free to conclude any agreements we want so far as our domestic economy is concerned, but we must observe international law in situations having to do with our external economic activities, Mr. Medvedkov stresses.

The setting up of a customs union means that no duties are levied on the goods and services exchanged by the countries making up the economic community, and that goods and services imported from third countries are subject to duties levied at the rates specified in a single customs tariff, says economist Aleksandr Shevchenko.

In his view, the Agreement on an Economic Union, which former Soviet republics that have become sovereign states are prepared to sign even now, is based on a concept of a tariff and customs union which is not entirely in conformity with internationally accepted trade practices.

Thus, Mr. Shevchenko says, Article XXIV of GATT specifies that an integrated customs territory is ensured by the absence of tariff constraints (i.e., customs duties) and non-tariff constraints (i.e , quotas and licencing) on trade within this territory, as well as by a single customs tariff and a single system of trade regulation (eg, in the form of licencing) applied to trade with third countries. That is, according to world standards, a single customs territory is preserved only when all elements of foreign trade regulatory framemork (customs tariffs and other types of trade regulation) continue to be applied in a consistent manner throughout this territory.

Article 38 of the agreement on an economic union, says Mr. Shevchenko, calls for preserving a single customs territory, whereas article 37 provides for independent regulation by member states of their eternal economic activities, for example through quota-setting and licencing.

Mr. Shevchenko suggests the following wording of this article, which he believes to be more acceptable.

"The members of the economic community shall preserve a single customs territory and to this end shall impose no tariff or non-tariff constraints on trade among them.

"The members of the economic community shall establish a customs union with a single customs tariff and common trade regulations to be applied to third countries."

The demise of the USSR, on the one hand, and the non-existence of a new union of sovereign states, on the other hand, make a customs union of the kind created by the European Communities the most acceptable option for this country, believes Mr. Medvedkov. The European model is based in particular on a single customs tariff and the conduct of external economic policy on the basis of standardised licencing, quota-setting and product certification procedures.

A similar model was adopted in the USSR on July 1 this year. It had a serious drawback, however, in that there were a number of products for which no quotas whatever were set by the centre. This resulted in an outflow of products from republics which assigned quotas for the export of these products to republics that did not do so. There is good reason to suppose that this would have led republics to throw up customs barriers to stem such outflows of goods, and to introduce regulations requiring specification of the origin of products.

The European Communities are reported to save about 5% of their aggregate GNP due to the abolition of borders and the scrapping of customs duties. This figure would be much larger for ex-Soviet republics because the expenses involved in setting up new customs posts and meeting a huge payroll could be avoided.

It was, besides, not quite clear, says Mr. Medvedkov, who was responsible for further movement of these goods and the observance of international export and import agreements.

The regulations of external economic activities which are currently being proposed look more like a political compromise than a serious and well-thought-out economic document, says Mr. Medvedkov. In his view, the new economic community will be efficient only if it is based on internationally accepted legal principles.

First Congress of Soviet Germans Opens 18 Oct

Build Assembly With 'Clout'

OW1510010491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2020 GMT 14 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Academician Boris Rauschenbach, chairman of the organizing committee of the first congress of Soviet Germans which is opening in Moscow on October 18, described the event as an attempt to build "an assembly representing Soviet Germans that would have clout." He said at a Monday [14 October] press-conference that the agenda including issues on which all groupings of Soviet Germans have reached consensus: the restoration of the Republic of Volga Germans, the need for its official recognition by Soviet and Russian authorities and aid to the development of German autonomies outside the future republic. The autonomies are located in the Altay and in Omsk and Novosibirsk regions.

According to Rauschenbach, the German problem is different from other issues in that it is particularly painful for the country, not for the Germans themselves as the emigration of every 100,000 ethnic Germans to Germany costs the USSR 4 billion rubles in losses. The academician is convinced that it is necessary to persuade the Soviet Germans not to emigrate to Germany, which is easier said than done. Braving the inevitable difficulties attended with emigration, the Germans pursue but one objective: to ensure a good life for their children.

Asked by IF [INTERFAX], Ruashenbach said that the sovereignty of the Soviet Germans' republic will mean that the German language and culture will have priority on its territory. No political decisions discordant with the policies of the Russian leadership will be taken. Other ethnic groups living in the republic will have equal rights with the Germans, said he.

The official language of the three-day 1st Congress of the Soviet Germans will be Russian as only 60% of the 1034 delegates speak German. Soviet and Russian leaders and officials of Germany's Home and Foreign Ministries have been invited to the forum.

'Closer Than Ever' to Autonomy

LD1810031191 Moscow TASS in English
1212 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—A congress of Soviet Germans will be held in Moscow from October 18 to October 20 to clarify the main problem of ethnic Germans in the USSR, the restoration of their autonomous republic around the Volga reaches.

The autonomous republic of Germans was unlawfully eliminated by the Stalin regime in 1941 and Germans were dispersed over vast territories of several republics. Large numbers of Germans left for Germany, so the German ethnic group is about to cease to exist in the USSR. Out of the two million Germans residing in the USSR, according to official statistics, from 105 to 150 thousand were leaving the USSR every year over recent years.

The Germans are now closer than ever to the restoration of their autonomous republic. Russian leaders have drawn up a plan for resolving the problem, and the plan was fully backed by Germany. It is now for ethnic Germans in Russia to have their say and such problems will be decided at the forum.

Delimitation of frontiers poses difficulties. The republic cannot be restored with its former boundaries. Part of leaders of the Volgograd and Saratov Regions and of the population of these regions in some areas that were formerly within the autonomous republic object to its restoration.

A representative of the Russian Government, possibly Boris Yeltsin, is to make a political statement about plans to restore the autonomous republic. The legislative decision will possibly be adopted by the Russian Supreme Council late this year or early next year.

It should be noted that the appearance of a new autonomous republic on the Russian map promises considerable advantages to the entire population living there. Legislative protection will be given to the interests of the entire population. Programmes for the construction of housing and infrastructure of the region, the setting up of medium and small enterprises, as well as considerable material and technological aid from Germany will turn the autonomous republic into one of the most prosperous districts of Russia.

Poll Rates Support of Leading Politicians

OW1410081191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
0710 GMT 14 Oct 91

["Viewpoint" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Participants in the September poll by the National Public Opinion Studies Center (VCIOM) rated politicians Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Silayev and Sobchak. The poll as taken among 2075 people from all over the Soviet Union, the "Data" agency says.

	Percentages			
Politician	entirely in favor	not entirely in favor	not at all in favor	could not say
Gorbachev	15	42	31	12
Yeltsin	49	30	8	13
Silayev	35	20	9	36
Sobchak	37	23	1	29

The Soviet president is more popular in Central Asia, there 21 percent support him as opposed to only 15 percent on average in the USSR.

Yeltsin is loved most of all in Russia, where 57 percent responded in his favor, versus 49 percent on average.

Silayev and Sobchak are not well known to the population as a whole, especially in the Ukraine.

Margin of error - 3 percent.

TASS Carries Press Reviews

16 Oct

LD1610080391 Moscow TASS in English
0716 GMT 16 Oct 91

["Press review"—Tass Headline]

[Text] Moscow October 16 TASS—Newspapers report the arrival of President Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia and President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia and their talks with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russia's President Boris Yeltsin.

Today's press reports the development of events at the country's flashpoints. The situation in South Ossetia is growing worse, with Georgian militants continuing to fire on the city of Tskhinvali, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes.

The Georgian parliament has urged the leadership of the USSR and Russia to withdraw Interior Ministry troops from South Ossetia, NEZAVISEMAYA GAZETA (INDEPENDENT GAZETTE) points out. The parliament's judgement is that the stay of Interior Ministry troops on the territory of Georgia is not lawful.

The Estonian side is busy building pillboxes, trenches and machine-gun emplacements on the border with Pskov region, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports.

In TRUD, the newspaper's correspondents in Baku and Yerevan discuss the Yeltsin-Nazarbayev peace-making mission aimed at settling the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. "There has appeared a glimmer of hope", the headline proclaims.

The situation in Tatarstan is causing concern, PRAVDA writes in comment on the situation in the republic. Enlistment in a people's volunteer corps is in progress. Volunteers enlist under the banners of the all-Union Tatar social centre. "Girding for a fight, against whom?" the newspaper queries, pointing to the unlawful nature of these actions.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) has introduced a new rubric "a view from the editorial office". Today it carries an article by publicist Gennadiy Miranovich about the state of affairs in the Army following the August coup.

Aleksandr Chernyak in PRAVDA examines the position of the rouble which "is now in agony—hyperinflation is manifest. The rouble is moribund rather than living," Chernyak maintains. The main cause of that is the Union's break-up which entailed a production slump, he points out.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA carries an exclusive interview with David Kimhe, ambassador at large at the Israeli Foreign Ministry, who told the newspaper that two problems are now uppermost in the minds of Israeli people—the accommodation and full integration of tens of thousands of immigrant Jews from the Soviet Union into Israeli society.

Touching upon the question of restoration of relations between Israel and the Soviet Union, Kimhe said that he would like to see Soviet-Israeli relations to be "very close and trustful".

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA returns to the scandal connected with the publication of records of the interrogation of members of the state- of-emergency committee in the German DER SPIEGEL magazine.

The newspaper today runs interviews with the defence lawyers of the arrested, who set out their opinions on that score. G. Padva, defence lawyer of the arrested former Soviet parliament speaker Anatoliy Lukyanov, described the publication of interrogation records as an act bordering on an offence.

The INDEPENDENT GAZETTE in this connection asks a question as to who needed interrogation records to be published in DER SPIEGEL. The newspaper sets out its own version of this, asserting that not everything was handed over to Germany.

In PRAVDA, people's deputy Yuriy Golik analyses crime-development trends over the past two to three years in conjunction with the socio-political ferment of our days and concludes that the country is on the threshold of qualitative changes in crime patterns in the country.

Golik believes that crime in the country will be so rampant in the coming years that "our law enforcement system will not be able to even register crimes committed, apart from being unable to hold it in check."

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA commenting on the growing crime in the country notes that the Soviet Union is now ahead the United States in the number of murders. The newspaper believes that the main reason of this is that the prestige of power and law in the country has been lost.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and the INDEPENDENT GAZETTE raise the issue of Russian refugees from sovereign republics. The process will soon become one of the main concerns of the Russian leaders. "Will Russia accommodate them?" the INDEPENDENT GAZETTE queries. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA emphasises that hundreds of thousands of Russians are prepared to emigrate from republics "but who will help them?"

TRUD carries an interview with the recently appointed television chief Yegor Yakovlev, former editor-in-chief of the MOSCOW NEWS weekly, who is now a member of the advisory council to the president.

17 Oct

LD1710170791 Moscow TASS in English
1547 GMT 17 Oct 91

["Press Review"—TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—Some central newspapers make an attempt today to sum up the results of the first 100 days of Boris Yeltsin's presidency.

A KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA observer believes that the main result of Yeltsin's 100 days is that he is ceasing to be a revolutionary in the Bolshevik meaning of the word. This is why it would be a rather simplified approach to describe him as a destructive force for doing away with the old system according to the newspaper, not only his political opponents, but also electors are getting more and more sceptical about Yeltsin.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA writes in this connection that the failure of the August putsch gave Yeltsin a real, long coveted power and increased confidence in him at the same time but it is high time to make some use both of power and confidence according to NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, Yeltsin seems to have realised that utterly unpopular economic measures will have to be [word indistinct] ahead of winter.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes on this subject that now the peoples of the Russian Federation are directing their claims to Yeltsin.

Numerous articles published by central newspapers deal with the current situation in Russia and its future.

TRUD carries an interview with Vladimir Maksimov, a Russian writer, founder of the CONTINENT magazine now living in Paris. He was stripped of Soviet citizenship in [word indistinct] speaking about the future of Russian he pointed out that if disintegration is not stopped, it will be the end of Russian history as such. It may well become the end of human history, because Russia, cornered and hungry, but with an enormous nuclear arsenal, may react to its global humiliation in a most unpredictable way. He suggests that both Russian and Western politicians remember Germany after the first World War.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries a joint interview with Russian legislators Sergey Baburin and Nikolay Pavlov under the headline "Motherland Is Not for Sale." They have just returned from a trip to the Kuril Islands. According to Baburin and Pavlov, an openly pro-Japanese stand of some officials from the Russian administration triggered a wave of protests in the Kuril Islands and Sakhalin. The Russian legislators stressed that most people living on the islands regard the territory as Soviet, Russian land.

The abortive coup attempt continues to attract the attention of mass media.

V. Demin, deputy director of the National Institute for Consolidating Law and Order, has contributed an article to PRAVDA. He said that "the recent publication by DER SPIEGEL magazine of verbatim reports of several interrogations of members of the state emergency committee is not the result of actions of some forces, which are interested in a definte outcome of the investigation." He believes that "the information that leaked into the press actually did not add anything to what is already known to the public, that 'no secret strategy may be hidden behind the leakage.'"

Another lawyer describes the August putsch as "a conspiracy of the doomed" in an article published by TRUD. He writes that "the junta needed a legal coverage" and chairman of the federal parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov intended to provide this coverage by convening a parliamentary session. The item on its agenda was "the approval of the decision to impose the state of emergency on some areas." According to the newspaper, "the creation as soon as possible of the power structure, based not on the unconditional subordination of interests of the minority to those of the majority, but on a balance of interests of all sections of the population" should become the most important lesson of the putsch.

Vladimir Ivashko, former deputy general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, has given an interview to NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, in which he rejects the complicity of the party leadership in the coup attempt in Moscow. He said that "the people from the State Emergency Committee were acting in conditions of deep secrecy."

Newspapers give wide coverage to the situation in the hotbeds of tension.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN carries a large article by a correspondent in the Chechen-Ingush Republic. It says that the executive committee of the National Chechen Congress, which seized power in the republic, is coming up against the growing opposition from other parties and movements. Rallies are going on in Groznyy, some in support for the executive committee, others against it. People are not handing in their weapons, despite the decree of the Russian parliament.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reports that blood was shed in Kazan during the first day of the work of the Tatarstan parliament. Nationalistically-minded supporters of the all-Union Tatar public centre attacked participants in a meeting of the Democratic Party of Russia. The newspaper quotes members of the Democratic Party of Russia as saying that "the Tatar Republic is really independent of civilised laws. Party apparatchiks who have slightly changed colours are reigning supremely there."

Commenting on talks, held by President Gorbachev in Moscow with the Serbian and Croatian leaders, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA points out that "the president has almost reconciled Serbians and Croatians, while fighting is going on in Nagorno-Karabakh and the Azerbaijani government intends to distribute weapons among the population." Azerbaijani President Ayaz Mutalibov said that his republic "is at war with Armenia."

According to PRAVDA, the testing of a self-propelled wheeled robot, intended for the study of Mars, began in Moscow. The device, the so-called small Mars-walking robot, weighs only 75 kg, but it can perform many operations. It will become a prototype model of a full-size Mars walking machine with a weight of 400 to 500 kg. According to the current plans, the small-size Mars walking robot will be delivered to Mars in the second half of the 90's, and the full-size robot—at the end of the century.

Army General Vladimir Lobov, chief of the general staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, has given an interview to

PRAVDA. He stressed that the republics should conclude an agreement on collective defence, involving single armed forces and a single command of strategic nuclear forces.

18 Oct

LD1810082691 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 18 Oct 91

["Press Review"—Tass Headline]

[Text] Moscow October 18 TASS—Central newspapers continue to publish materials dealing with the current situation and the future of Russia. They focus their attention on the settlement of the problem of nationalities and economic problems.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA frontpages an interview with Nikolay Medvedev, chairman of the Russian parliamentary commission for the national and state setup and inter-ethnic relations. He points out that "the problem of nationalities is being used now by many political forces." The interview deals mostly with the development of relations between Russia and the republics. Medvedev believes it is necessary to "draw a clear line between the rights of a nation and the kindling of inter-ethnic strife." Speaking about possible conflicts between the native population and people of Russian extraction in former Union republics, he stresses that "Russia will not leave the compatriots tete-a-tete with their problems." "All treaties with republics include items specifying the rights of the Russian-speaking population," he says.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, PRAVDA and TRUD write about the election of Ter-Petrosyan first president of Armenia. Quoting "unofficial sources," TRUD writes that 83 per cent of electors voted for Ter- Petrosyan. Two other contenders, Paryuir Airikyan and Sos Sarkisyan, got 7.45 and 4.15 per cent of votes respectively. The remaining two candidates are well behind.

The press continues to give wide coverage to the problem of food supply in the forthcoming winter. V. Nefedov, head of the Department of Agricultural Statistics at the USSR State Committee for Statistics, says in a TRUD interview that Russian collective and state farms continue to hamper grain sales to the state. On October 7, 20.2 million tonnes of grain were purchased—one third less than in 1990. Only 22 per cent of the threshed grain have been sold.

PRAVDA writes on this subject with reference to the information of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, that gross grain output will be some 160 million tonnes (not counting the Baltic Republics), which is 25 per cent less than in 1990. The situation in industry is worsening. Industrial output went down by 6.4 per cent during the past nine months. According to the newspaper, the decline in the discipline of contractual deliveries is one of the reasons. It writes that the volume of goods that failed to be delivered to consumers is estimated at 31.6 billion roubles.

TRUD carries an interview with Konstantin Borovoy, president of the Russian Commodity and Raw Materials Exchange. It deals with the stock exchange movement and its impact on the economic and political situation in the country. "The movement is gaining momentum, showing vividly that the future depends on the economic situation," Borovoy says. He believes the stock exchanges not only transform the economy, but also introduce the market system, propagate a new style of work, based on the commercial initiative of entrepreneurs. According to Borovoy, "the forces that are now in power do not know how to handle a market-based economy." The critical food situation will be overcome and the threat of hunger warded off, if land is turned over to private owners as soon as possible, along with granting easy-term and even interest-free credits to farmers.

Yevgeniy Saburov, Russian deputy prime minister and minister of economy, whose resignation was not accepted by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, gave an interview to TRUD after the confirmation of his prerogatives. Responding to the question about the future of the rouble and a possible monetary reform, the minister says that "the Russian Ministry of Economy did not prepare proposals on the monetary reform and does not know anything about it." "I am not familiar with the Russian president's statement. I think there must be some misunderstanding," Saburov says. According to Saburov, it is not expedient to implement the reform now. "The programme of the transition to a market-based economy does not envisage a monetary reform," he points out. He believes the situation in Russia may be improved in 1993-1994. He also mentiones "utter incompetence" of some members of the republican government in economic problems. "The reform problem is often tackled by amateurs," he says.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes with reference to TASS and RIA, that General Konstantin Kobets, Russian state adviser on defence matters, described as "nonsense which would not be permitted by any reasonable person" the information of MOSCOW NEWS that "a possible exchange of nuclear blows between the independent Ukraine and Russia was discussed last week in the lobbies of the Russian Government."

"The Russian State Committee for Defence Matters exists only on paper," says Deputy Chairman of the Committee, USSR People's Deputy Colonel Vladimir Lopatin in a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA interview. Stressing Russia's leading role in deciding defence problems (it accounts for two thirds of defence spendings), the federal legislator insists on its priority role in deciding the problems dealing with the reform of the defence system and the Armed Forces. "The apparatus structures of the republican leadership hamper in every way the creation of an effective defence committee," Lopatin stresses.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries reports about the situation in the hotbeds of tension—Nagorno-Karabakh, the Chechen-Ingush Republic and South Ossetia.

PRAVDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and TRUD report the coming to the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department of Igor Malakhov, wanted in connection with the recent murder of the well- known singer and musician Igor Talkov. Malakhov gave his version of the incident.

International sections of newspapers report the developments in Yugoslavia, the Middle East and a visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin to that region, as well as the meeting of G-7 countries in Bangkok.

Economic

Silayev Censures Preservation of 'Old Form'

OW1710161491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the Inter-Republican Economic Committee (IREC) Ivan Silayev told the second congress of labor staff representatives in Moscow on Thursday [17 October] that his committee was not planning to restore the national military-industrial complex or any analagous structures. He said defense-sector plants should promote cooperation with firms in the West by means of solving the problem of closed cities which he described as "an invention of the past."

Mr. Silayev said the IREC did not intend to set up new central ministries or other government agencies. He said "only those ministries will be left which the republics themselves choose to preserve."

Expressing concern that some ministerial structures had been "changing signboards" and reforming into concerns or associations, Mr. Silayev supported the worker demand that structures of this kind should undergo re-registration.

He censured the idea of preserving the state order in its old form. "We've been too slow about permitting labor staffs to independently dispose of the products they put out. Of course, the state may retain a share to itself, but this share must be very modest," Silayev said.

Replying to journalists' questions, the IREC chairman said he did not see any danger in the introduction of republican currencies. "We must only make sure the ruble is properly protected as the inter-republican currency," he observed. Mr. Silayev said measures should be taken to prevent the setting up of custom checkpoints at the borders of ex-Soviet republics once the republican currencies were introduced.

Experts Forecast Impact of Economic Community

OW1810050791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[From the "Soviet Business Report" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Some of the former 15 Soviet republics are likely to ignore the signing of a treaty to establish the economic community of the sovereign republics that has been set for October 18.

MACROECON, an independent research centre that employs leading experts from a variety of central agencies and research institutes, has drawn up a forecast to spell out the macroeconomic impact of the treaty, on condition that the Baltics, Georgia and Moldova stay out of the community.

Soviet GNP To Drop 6%

In 1990, per capita GNP was 120% of the average national (Union) figure in Latvia, 116% in Lithuania, 132% in Estonia, 85% in Georgia and 93% in Moldova.

The analysis indicates that if the five republics stay away from the economic community, the community's aggregate social product [as received] is likely to drop 6.2%—GNP, 6.1%; gross industrial product, in terms of volume, 6%; agricultural output, 7.6%; volume of construction and transportation, 5.4%; trade and public catering, 6.7%: revenues from foreign trade, 3.2%.

The Soviet Union stands to lose the following: (approximately in % to overall Soviet production)

	Total	Georgia	Lithuania	Moldova	Latvia	Estonia
Electricity	4.9	0.9	1.7	1.0	0.3	1.0
Rolled ferrous metals	2.1	1.0	-	0.4	0.7	-
Alternating current motors	11.3	2.5	4.6	1.9	-	2.3
Metal-cutting machine tools	8.0	1.4	6.6	-	-	-
Livestock equipment and facilities	7.7	0.1	2.6	0.4	4.2	0.4
Excavators	4.5	-	-	-	-	4.5
Chemical fibers and threads	6.6	2.4	0.9	-3.3	-	-
Paper	6.0	0.4	1.9	-	2.2	1.5
Bricks	7.1	3.1	2.4	-	-	1.0

	Total	Georgia	Lithuania	Moldova	Latvia	Estonia
Knitted goods	13.0	2.9	3.2	3.5	2.2	1.2
Footwear	8.3	2.0	1.4	2.8	1.2	0.9
Radio sets	17.4	-	-	-	17.4	-
Washers	13.0	-	4.2	9.1	-	-
Meat	9.4	0.8	3.4	1.9	1.9	1.4
Sea products	13.6	1.3	3.7	0.08	4.9	3.6
Butter	10.8	0.07	4.5	1.7	2.7	1.8

Refusal To Join the Economic Community on Part of the Five Republics May Be Harmful for the USSR

On balance, the Baltic states are importers, not exporters: they import ferrous and non-ferrous metals, motor vehicles, tractors, timber, fertilizers, etc. Some of the Baltic enterprises are, however, national leaders in the production of components for motor vehicles and tractors and of TV sets and computers.

The Baltics account for 31.3% of the electricity produced by the integrated power grid of the north-west of the USSR and for 5.2% of the electricity generated in the European part of the USSR. If electricity output drops in the Baltics, Belorussia and Kaliningrad region in Russia may be affected.

Georgia's staying away from the community will also be bad for both the republic and the USSR. Georgia is a major producer of electric locomotives and several kinds of airplanes. A factory in the city of Zestafoni accounts for ⅓ of the national production of carbonaceous ferromagnetic alloys that are used to produce cold-resistant steel and ferrites for electronic equipment.

Georgia grows 97% of the country's citrus crops and 92% of quality tea. Several ports and resorts are located on the Black Sea coast in that republic, which has already proclaimed independence.

And some of the factories in Moldova remain monopoly manufacturers of electric loaders, truck trailers and refrigerator trucks.

But the Five Non-Signers are Likely To Face Even More Pain Than Those Who Plan To Join the Community

The following parameters are of importance in predicting the consequences of non-participation of the Baltics, Georgia and Moldova in the economic community (data of 1989):

	Volume of deliveries (billion rubles)	%
Total of interrepublican exports including the five republics:	192.7	100
total exports	26.4	13.7
total imports	30.3	15.7
balance of interrepublican trade		-3.9
Total of exports to foreign nations (in domestic prices)	49.5	100
including the five republics:	1.7	3.4
Total of imports from foreign nations (in domestic prices)	94.7	100
including the five republics	6.7	6.1
Balance of the five republics foreign trade (in domestic prices)		-5.0

A comparison between the combined exports (13.7%) and imports (15.7%) of the Baltic countries, Georgia and Moldova on the one hand, and their combined share in the national income (6%) and GDP (6.2%) on the other, indicates that their economies depend on republican ties to a higher-than-average extent.

Committee Promotes Formation of Common Market

LD1810032591 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Petrenko]

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—"To promote the formation of a common market throughout the former Soviet Union" is the main purpose of the contemplated Inter-state (Inter-republican) Economic Community (IEC), members of the IEC organising committee told a news conference here today.

They presented a package of documents concerning the IEC status, the rights and duties of IEC members, and a mechanism for IEC activities.

News conference organisers believe that a distinguishing feature of the IEC is that both state structures and free enterprise organisations are expected to participate in its work on a parity basis.

A lasting alliance, not confrontation, as was previously the case, will make it possible to develop the economy successfully. The door is also open for foreign partners to join the IEC, if they so wish.

The IEC expects to build an inter-state trade and economic centre as its headquarters in Moscow or in some other city. It will also found a bank, a stock exchange, a news agency, and a radio and television network of the IEC.

In response to a question about the forthcoming signing of an economic union treaty by the heads of sovereign republics, Vladimir Vakhaniya, chairman of the IEC organising committee and president of the Soyuz-Vozrozhdeniye (Union-Rebirth) Corporation, said that the IEC would only welcome the conclusion of such a treaty.

The future IEC—its founding conference is to be held in February 1992—will begin to practise principles inherent in this treaty, Vakhaniya said.

Economist for Debt Deferment, Deficit Reduction

AU1710152191 Dusseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 17 Oct 91 p 18

[Report by "KR": "Monetary Measures and Establishment of Western Banking System Have Priority"]

[Text] Frankfurt, 16 October—In order to eliminate the danger of social unrest, the Soviet Union urgently needs pharmaceuticals as well as $25 to $30 billion for the import of consumer goods and another $10 billion for building brickyards and for providing technical equipment to agriculture. This statement was made by economist Nikolay Shmelev, who is a member of his country's reform elite.

As the member of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies stated at the Frankfurt Economic Journalists' Club, he considers a "certain deferment" of debts for three to five years necessary because the servicing of debts currently devours 50 percent of the foreign currency revenues. Shmelev wants to use imports, which are to be financed on commercial conditions, to fill the shelves so as to encourage the people a bit, as they are gradually losing patience because of the general economic uncertainty, and, at the same time, to siphon off the enormous money surplus. He thinks that there is no justification for devaluing the currency because the people do not trust anybody, "neither Yeltsin nor Gorbachev."

Shmelev hopes that the country's leader will finally stop "distributing power" and be resolute about setting the switches for the market economy. He thinks that at the moment it is particularly important to sign the treaty on a common economic area, which must contain firm commitments. Because of their great dependence on the Russian republic—all union republics have a passive trade balance with Russia; Russia provides the annual $50 billion for price subsidies—Shmelev expects most Union republics will be willing to sign the treaty. However, he is worried about the emergence of Russian nationalism, and he fears that the Russian leadership might provoke the other republics so as to make them refuse to sign the economic treaty.

In addition to a drastic reduction of the state deficit, which currently amounts to 30 percent of the gross national product, the Moscow economist gives top priority to measures "for the reestablishment of normal functioning of the money." He estimates the value of state property he ultimately wants to privatize at 2,000 billion rubles.

Shmelev pointed out that a common market without a common (convertible) currency cannot work. Even though he does not rule out that individual republics will make every effort to have their own national currency, he does not think that such efforts have much chance of enduring success. In addition, he considers it extremely important to quickly establish a banking system structured in line with western examples, a unified customs system, common funds, and a unified state budget.

If the politicians do not follow this path over the next few months, he predicts a further deterioration of the range of goods available, ration cards, confiscation of money, social unrest, and a complete disintegration of the country. He describes the dimensions of future unemployment by pointing out that about one-third of all working people are superfluous—"even on the basis of our technical standards."

Success of Reforms of Market Economy 'Vital'

AU1710151891 Frankfurt am Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 17 Oct 91 p 24

[Report by "MH": "The USSR Wants To Use Military Secrets for Economic Purposes"]

[Text] Frankfurt, 16 October—The Soviet Union wants to make accessible to the international economy the research results and developments that have so far been exclusively used for military purposes. In the three-day "World Business Days" exhibition, which will be held between 19 and 21 November in Moscow, and to which representatives from about 50 countries have been invited, these results are to be offered to foreign enterprises, which will then be able to use these previously secret developments together with Soviet enterprises, the responsible official for the exhibition, Professor Konstantin W. Frolov, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said in a talk in Frankfurt.

One should not fear that the Soviet Army will thwart this plan, which is necessary to embark on the path leading toward a working market economy, Frolov said. Reducing the size of the Army means that about 5 million people will lose their jobs, unless certain developments can be used for civilian purposes. Frolov mentioned, for example, energy-saving metallurgical processes, new treatment of surfaces, and laser technology. For the recovery of the Soviet Union it is indispensable to convert the overinflated armament sector into the production of civilian goods. However, this is possible only with Western technological assistance, which is more important than new credits. Frolov stated that this offers German enterprises, which are characterized by high technological standards, opportunities, whose risks would pay off in two to three years.

For the Soviet Union the success of reforms related to the market economy is vital, economic scientist Professor Nikolay P. Shmelyov, a member of the Soviet People's Deputies Congress and of the planning, budget, and finance commission. The most urgent condition is that the republics of the Union now sign the economic agreement, intended to guarantee a single economic area. Without this agreement most republics—apart from Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan—will be unable to survive. So far, Moscow has supported the republics each year with $50 billion in subsidies. Without a joint economic area, a single currency, and a working Western-style banking system the individual republics would be unable to compete on international markets for 10 to 15 years. At the moment the country lives virtually without any money but more or less on the basis of a primitive system of exchanging goods. The rubles are used but not invested.

To prevent social unrest it is first of all necessary to fill the shelves in the shops, if necessary even through imports paid with borrowed money. The country needs standby credit, which should be granted under commercial conditions. In Shmelyov's view, old credits should be deferred by three to five years. He spoke out against overrating the Soviet Union's indebtedness.

New 200-Ruble Bank Notes Introduced

LD1810042191 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—The Soviet mint, the Gosznak printing amalgamation which carries out state orders for printing money, official state documents and securities, has began producing 200-rouble bank notes, according to "MOSCOW NEWS" weekly with reference to Soviet State Bank Deputy Board Chairman Valeryan Kulikov.

Kulikov also said the new bank notes will be larger than the present ones. The same is true for 500-rouble notes which will be printed from January next year. The new bank notes will continue the 1961 bill series bearing Lenin's profile.

Manufacture of the new printing plates alone costs almost 100 thousand dollars.

Agricultural

Crop Yields Reported Down From Last Year

OW1810034991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[From the "Soviet Business Report" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As of October 14, the Soviet grain output, after the thrashing stage, was 164 million tons [as received], or 25% less than at the same date last year. Harvesting has been finished on 9/10 of all area under grain crops.

By October 14, the state had bought from Soviet farmers a mere 37.7 million tons of grain (importantly, the overwhelming majority of Soviet population buy foodstuffs through the state distribution system). This means that farmers have so far sold 25% of the grain they have produced this year, as compared with 37% on the average in the years 1981 through 1989.

	state purchase (million tons)	% change from 1990
wheat	22.2	-42%
rye	5.5	-42%
millet	0.63	-59%
buckwheat	0.22	-35%
rice	0.88	+3%

Deliveries of quality grain seeds to state-owned storage facilities dropped 9% from last year, reports the USSR Agriculture and Food Ministry. Despite the drop, needs for grain seeds have been fully met during the sowing period this autumn; Soviet farms have already sown 34.2 million hectares to winter grain crops, or 3.5 million hectares more than last year.

As of October 14, raw cotton output was 5.79 million tons, including 0.637 million tons of fine-fibre strains, as compared with 7.09 and 0.84 million tons respectively at this date last year (the total raw cotton output was 8.3 million tons in 1990).

Following is the breakdown by republics:

cotton output (thousand tons)			
	10.14.91	% of target figure	10.14 90
Uzbekistan	3,530.2	79.4	4,467.9
Kazakhstan	190.1	65.4	224.9
Azerbaijan	533.3	101.4	495.2
Kyrghyzstan	48.0	81.4	76.6
Tadjikistan	459.6	55.0	668.9
Turkmenia	1,028.3	79.5	1,164.6

By October 14 the state had purchased 235,000 tons of linen flax, or 100,000 tons less than last year.

Sugar beets have been harvested at more than 75% of the area under the crop. This crop's yield dropped some 20% from last year. Sugar-producing factories have already processed 19.1 million tons of sugar beets to produce 2,086,000 tons of sugar (2,368,000 tons last year).

Significant Rains Complicate Most Harvesting

924A0075A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 Oct 91 p 2

[Article by T. Rossinskaya, agricultural meteorologist: "The Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Very warm weather for this season set in over the European territory of the country. The average air temperature exceeded the annual average by 3-6 degrees. The maximum temperature in the northern half of the territory was 18-25 degrees and 26-30 degrees in the southern half. Over the last 20 years it has been that warm in 1974, 1981, 1984, 1985, and 1988.

The weather favored the completion of harvest work over the majority of the European territory. However, in the northern half of the Baltic area, in the Northwestern, Northeastern, and a majority of the Central regions, in a number of southwestern, central, and far northern oblasts of the Ukraine, in Moldova, and in western Kursk Oblast significant rains (11-30 mm and more) complicated the harvest.

Light frosts at the surface of the soil were observed almost everywhere, and they may have harmed tuber and root crops and vegetables that have been dug up but not covered.

Winter grain crops sown in August and at the beginning of September were tillering in the Northern, Volga-Vyatka, Ural, and in the north of the Central regions. The cultivable layer of the soil here contained 35-45 mm of productive moisture. In places the soil was sodden. On the other hand, in individual rayons of the Southern Urals the upper layer of the soil in fields with winter crops sown in nonfallow rotation contains insufficient rotation.

In the western Ukraine and Moldova the growth and development of winter crops also progressed under conditions of sufficient warmth and moisture. Here the winter crops sown prior to 20 September were tillering. In the eastern and southeastern oblasts of the Ukraine, the southeastern Central-Chernozem region, most of the territory of the Northern-Caucasus region, a number of rayons of the Central Volga region, and the Lower Volga region, where dry weather had predominated for a long time, the store of productive moisture in the cultivable layer of the soil declined and constituted 7-10 mm. In places, especially in fields sown in nonfallow rotation, the upper layer of the soil was almost completely dried out.

Over most of the territory of Western Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan insignificant precipitation which fell in individual rayons in the east over the course of one to three days did not present substantial obstacles to the harvest of agricultural crops. By the end of the ten-day period the upper layer of the soil had frozen slightly. The growth and development of winter grain crops took place under favorable conditions for the majority of the ten-day period.

In Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, the eastern regions of Uzbekistan, and a number of regions of Turkmenia there was rain and the collected cotton required additional drying. In places in Samarkand Oblast hard rains with hail and wind caused harm to cotton, vegetable, and fruit crops.

Decline in Livestock Causes 'Special Concern'

924A0069A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 1

[Article from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Agricultural and Food: "We Will Make It Through the Winter. But How?"]

[Text] The last nine indicate that the animal husbandry situation is a complex one. The decline in the production of goods and in the productivity of the animals continues. Compared to the corresponding period last year, during January-September state purchases of cattle and poultry declined by 1,716,000 tonnes (12 percent), of milk by 7,423,000 tonnes (13 percent), and of eggs by 3.228 billion units (eight percent).

A significant decline in the number of livestock is giving rise to special concern. Just during the last year and the first half of this year the number of cattle on the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and mezhkhozes [interfarm associations] declined by almost 8 million head, the number of pigs by 10 million, and the number of sheep and goats by 19 million head. Especially alarming is the fact that a "disposal" of the female livestock is underway.

Recently the kolkhozes and sovkhozes have been rendering certain aid in the development of animal husbandry on peasant (private) farms and personal subsidiary plots of the population. In 1990 alone they were sold more than 3 million head of cattle, 25 million pigs, 6 million sheep and goats, and 1.3 billion head of poultry. However, results from the exploitation of these resources remain unimpressive. On the farms of the population the number of the first three types of livestock only increased by 0.8, 1.3, and 1.9 million head respectively.

Calculations show that at the end of the current year the number of cattle on all categories of farms consists of about 111.3 million head, or down 4.2 million from last year, the number of pigs is 70.3 million head (down 5.3 million), and the number of sheep and goats is 130 million head (down 10.5 million).

State purchases of livestock and poultry for the year are expected in the amount of 19.3 million tonnes, of milk, 68-68.5 million tonnes, of eggs, 46.4 billion units. All of this is significantly less than in preceding years. This is a direct result of hasty economic decisions, the violation of existing farm and production ties, reduced attention paid to questions of fodder production, and a decline in production and technological discipline.

The situation with the provision of fodders to livestock for the upcoming winter is complicated by unsatisfactory creation of fodder stocks. Throughout the country as a whole, less coarse and succulent fodders have been laid in than for last year. Given the expected volume of state purchases of grain it will not be possible to ensure forage resources for poultry and pork breeding and other state complexes, which deliver to centralized funds about 4.4 million tonnes of meat and 47 billion eggs. In addition, only one-third of the necessary quantity of raw protein materials from domestic production have been allotted. The shortage of grain forage and the associated protein imbalance will have an effect first and foremost on these enterprises and lead to a "disposal" of another no less than 12 million pigs and 80-100 million head of poultry.

The critical situation may be set right if it is possible to allot an additional 13-14 million tonnes of soy meal and 34 million tonnes of grain forage from state resources for minimal satisfaction of demands for balanced combined fodders.

Provision of veterinary preparations, detergents, and disinfectants to the animal husbandry sector is extremely unsatisfactory. The domestic industry is satisfying 20-30 percent of needs for them and there is practically no purchasing of imports taking place this year because of a lack of hard currency funds. This is leading to an increase in disease, a decline in productivity, and an increase in the abandonment and wastage of animals.

Because of a lack of provision of construction materials and equipment to the farms, a significant number of the farms and of feed preparation shops are not prepared for stabling, which will aggravate the problem even more of the productivity of animals during the winter period.

Founding Conference of Peasant Exchange Held

924A0070A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 27 Sep 91 p 2

[Article by Ye. Petrakov: "The Peasants Have Another Exchange"]

[Text] Under the conditions of the market economy auction trade is being developed increasingly. This is why the creation of more and more new exchanges of various kinds has become a sign of the times today. The founding conference of the Fermer All-Russian Peasant Exchange was held during 24-25 September in Moscow.

Opening the conference, President of the Association of Peasant Farms and Agricultural Cooperatives V.F. Bashmachnikov reminded the founders who had gathered there that until quite recently the number of freely operating peasants in Russia had barely exceeded 200. In the republic today there are about 30,000 peasant farms that employ more than 100,000 workers. And they need their own service structures, including trade. The money earned by the peasants should remain with the peasants. The newly created exchange is intended to contribute to this.

At first the exchange will be comprehensive—handling commercial, raw material, capital, and hard currency problems. In the future it is likely to divide into parts for handling these specialties.

The exchange has been created on a joint-stock basis.

Exchange Goal to 'Arrange Advantageous Sales'

924A0070B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 2

[Article by N. Aliyeva: "Exchange Chairman Is Editors' Guest"]

[Text] Yesterday the editorial collective met with the chairman of Rosagrobirzh and the Association of Exchange Structures of the agro-industrial complex, Aleksandr Vasilyevich Vasilyev.

At the roundtable there was an engaging discussion on the market relations that had developed in the country and the position and role of exchange structures in this process.

The republic commodity exchange of the agro-industrial complex Rosagrobirzh was registered by a decision of the Moscow Soviet of 29 November 1990. Today it includes 61 founders, more than 470 exchange members, and more than 200 brokerage offices. Members of the exchange include kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], processing and industrial enterprises, leased and farmer-run farms, agro-industrial formations of the krays, oblasts, and republics included in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], and foreign firms.

During six months of 1991 a total of about 4 billion rubles' [R] worth of products were put up for sale and R600 million worth of transactions were concluded. More than 75 percent of the overall volume of output was sold to enterprises and organizations of the agro-industrial complex.

"We set our task as obtaining large amounts of profit," noted A.V. Vasilyev. "Our goal is to help the peasants arrange advantageous sale of the products they have produced and to give them the opportunity to obtain various kinds of material and technical resources.

Military

Lobov Advocates Collective Defense Structure

LD1710113291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Chief of the General Staff Lobov has said that an agreement should be signed between the republics for collective defense providing for single armed force leadership and single management of nuclear arsenals. At the same time, General Kobets, the Russian state advisor on defense, has refuted reports which appeared yesterday that the possibility of an exchange of nuclear fire between independent Ukraine and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic was discussed last week in the corridors of the Russian parliament. According to

Kobets, neither the State Committee on Defense or any other Russian structure have discussed this issue.

Creation of 'Appearance of a Really New Army'

PM1810093191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 First Edition p 3

[By V. Nazarenko: "Report From Seminar in Vienna: The Armed Forces of the Renewed Union"]

[Text] The seminar on military doctrines in Vienna is continuing. During the seminar Colonel General F. Markovskiy, member of the Soviet delegation, drew participants' attention to the fact that the adoption of a new (coalition) military doctrine for the renewed Union predetermines the reorganization of the Armed Forces. It is planned to bring the structure of the Armed Forces into line with the principle of defense sufficiency in the very near future. As already reported, the number of branches of the Armed Forces will be reduced. They will comprise the Strategic Deterrent Forces, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Ground Defense Troops. At the same time the number of military districts, army directorates, and combined-arms divisions will be reduced. The effective combat strength of the Armed Forces will not exceed 3 million men.

Col. Gen. F. Markovskiy stated that motorized infantry and tank divisions, where the armored vehicle armament has been reduced and vehicles ensuring enhanced maneuverability on the battlefield and on the march excluded, have already switched to the new manning levels. Motorized infantry divisions now have 150 tanks, 637 armored vehicles, 216 artillery systems, 479 antitank weapons, and 269 air defense weapons. A tank division has 250 tanks, 402 armored vehicles, 210 artillery systems, and 233 air defense systems. It is planned to switch from an army-based system to one based on the corps and the brigade. It is intended that a brigade will have a total of 2,500-3,000 men, 50-60 tanks, 200-250 armored vehicles, roughly 50 cannon and mortar, and 50 air defense weapons. The number of corps and brigades in the European part of the Union will be determined so as to ensure that the levels of armaments, hardware, and personnel limited by the Treaty on Conventional Armaments in Europe are not exceeded.

It is envisaged that a number of committees and commissions will be set up in the Defense Ministry apparatus to enhance civilian monitoring of the Armed Forces' activity: for military policy and the economy, armaments orders and research and development, budget and finance, legal and social protection, civil defense, and rear services provision and construction. Representatives of sovereign republics will serve on these committees and commissions.

The switch to a professional army forms the basis of the Armed Forces' system of manpower acquisition. However, because at the present time the state is unable for economic reasons to effect a complete switchover, a mixed system of manpower acquisition for the Armed Forces is deemed the most rational.

The length of compulsory service is being reduced from 24 to 18 months for soldiers, sergeants, seamen, and petty officers. The initial term of service under contract is being set at 2.5 to three years with the possibility of extending it by three, five, or 10 years.

Expenditure on the purchase of arms and hardware will be reduced significantly in the course of the military reform. Expenditure for these purposes was already reduced by 17 billion rubles [R] during 1989-1990, and by a further R8.4 billion in the current year. Compared with 1988, deliveries of strategic missiles have been reduced by 40 percent, sea-launched ballistic missiles by 54 percent, tanks by 66 percent, armored vehicles by 80 percent, artillery systems by almost 60 percent, and combat aircraft by 50 percent. This trend will be maintained in 1992.

At the same time expenditure on the destruction of arms provided for in international treaties will not be reduced. On the contrary, it might increase. For example, more than R50 million was spent on the destruction of 825 launchers and 2,268 intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, while no less than R250 million at 1990 prices has to be spent on the destruction of conventional arms in accordance with the Paris Treaty. Considerable expenditure will also be required on the creation of centers for the elimination and conversion to peaceful purposes of many categories of arms, the construction of depots to store hardware, etc.

Finally, the state program for the conversion of the military industry provides for 422 defense enterprises and more than 100 enterprises in nondefense sectors to switch to producing civilian output. By 1995 the proportion of civilian output being produced will reach 65 percent as a result of reducing or ending production of military hardware in these enterprises.

These are the main areas of the reorganization of the Armed Forces of the renewed Union and the creation of the appearance of a really new army, which have been discussed in Vienna during these days.

Military-Industrial Reduction in Resources

PM1710151791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[From roundup of TASS, RIA, and correspondent reports: "The Country's Military-Industrial Complex Today"]

[Text] "The military-industrial complex today comprises 1,100 enterprises and 7.3 million people. Its fixed capital is worth 108 billion rubles [R]." A session of the directors of defense industry enterprises was told this 15 October by Professor Viktor Protasov, member of the Committee for the Operational Management of the USSR Economy and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

He cited figures on the reduction in resources for the military-industrial complex: The production of munitions has fallen by a factor of two and of infantry fighting vehicles by a factor of five. Viktor Protasov also reported that the intermediate- and shorter-range class of missiles has been completely taken out of production. Some 500,000 people (29 percent of the overall number of scientific workers) have left the sector as a result of the expenditure cuts.

Shaposhnikov Interviewed on Bullies, Deserters

LD1610175991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0955 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Unidentified correspondent's interview with Defense Minister Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] There are many problems in military collectives. We have frequently talked in our programs about bullying and desertion. What solutions do you see for these problems?

[Shaposhnikov] Yes, you are right. The Army is indeed suffering from the negative processes you mentioned. With the aim of eliminating these, I sent a letter appealing to soldiers, seamen and all personnel doing their obligatory military service in the Armed Forces. This message essentially boils down to the following position: Eradication of irregular treatment among personnel. The country's extraordinary congress of people's deputies ended just recently, at which a declaration was adopted on human rights and freedoms. This points out that the right to life is the inalienable right of every individual. The state gives protection against illegal violations against the individual. I therefore appealed to soldiers with more or less the following words: What, I wonder, can be singled out in a soldiers' collective? They are all the same. That is, they have the same rights and duties. But there is nevertheless a bunch of people which tear apart military collectives. And it seems to me, first and foremost, that every individual has the right to protection; and every transgressor is liable before Soviet law. I, therefore, want to say that the demands made upon such transgressors, and the degree to which they are held accountable, will be made many times greater. They will be made strictly criminally accountable. The soldier is a full citizen of our society, enjoying all rights. He is 18 years old, he has the right to vote and to be elected. But who gave him the right to mock other soldiers like himself? That's the first thing. Second, I want to say that many soldiers, when they leave to join the Army, are instructed by their parents: Son, serve well, obey your commanders and officers, be efficient and dependable, and so on and so forth. So why, then, do they forget these instructions when they are here? All the more so in that the parents' instructions wholly coincide with the requirements of commanders and officers and of the constitution and oath. Therefore, since the soldier is an individual like any other citizen of the Soviet Union, he should be just as responsible to his collective and his people, and to the Soviet judicial bodies as any other individual.

A second very serious question is that of desertion. I want to say that we want to make all the processes of life in our Soviet Army considerably more democratic. There may be an amnesty, or some other measures may be taken, but that is all up to a certain limit. And starting from this certain limit, we will also be enhancing the accountability for and the exactingness relating to all these infringements relating to desertion from the Soviet Army. I, therefore, appeal to soldiers, I appeal to mothers, to fathers, to parents, relatives and the near and dear ones of all personnel in our Soviet Army: We intend on the one hand to make more democratic relations in the Soviet Army, while on the other we want to place more exacting demands upon and make more accountable every individual for his own destiny and for the destiny of his closest comrades.

[Announcer] I very much liked the frankness that our new minister of defense showed in the interview. None of Yevgeniy Ivanovich Shaposhnikov's predecessors over the last 30 or so years has spoken so openly about the policy being conducted, nor has appealed to people for help and support in conducting that policy. But who can people turn to? One can try the following address: Moscow, Ulitsa Kirova, Dom 37, which is the receiving address of the USSR Ministry of Defense. Moscow, Ultisa Kirova 37.

New Baltic Fleet Commander Yegorov Interviewed

PM1610082991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Oct 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Vice Admiral Vladimir Grigoryevich Yegorov, commander of the Baltic Fleet, by correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak under the "First Interview in New Post" rubric; place and date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Baltic States, the Baltic Sea, the Baltic Fleet"]

[Text] Vice Admiral Vladimir Grigoryevich Yegorov has been appointed commander of the Baltic Fleet. He is 52 years old. He started his working life as a lathe operator at a Leningrad plant. He graduated with the gold medal from higher naval school, with distinction from the Naval Academy, and as an external student from the General Staff Academy. He served in the Northern, Black Sea, and Baltic Fleets, was commander of a command department, executive officer, and chief of staff of and commander of a formation, and commanded the Mediterranean Flotilla. Recently he was first deputy commander of the Baltic Fleet.

[Gromak] Vladimir Grigoryevich, many years of your service have been spent in the Baltic; you are well acquainted with the dynamics of the development of events in the region. Today the oblast center of Kaliningrad, where the fleet's headquarters are, seemingly finds itself isolated from the center and its main bases. What does this new situation mean for the Baltic Fleet?

[Yegorov] The independence of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania is a fact, and the leaderships of these sovereign states have already raised the question of the presence of Baltic Fleet forces on their territory. And we cannot fail to respect the will of the Baltic's parliaments and peoples. The fate of the fleet's forces in this region will undoubtedly be decided within the framework of interstate agreements. But we live in a world of realities and must realize that the withdrawal of the fleet's forces involves many military-political, economic, and social aspects. While leaving it to state structures to resolve the question of a possible sharp and one-sided imbalance in military forces between our state and NATO in the Baltic theater, I cannot help thinking about problems on a more down-to-earth level. Major fleet garrisons are located on the Baltic region's territory—and that means many thousands of officers, petty officers, members of their families, workers and employees of fleet enterprises, and Defense Ministry pensioners living at military posts. Today the letters we are receiving from them contain one question: "What will become of us?" Over many decades several generations of Baltic Fleet sailors have constructed barracks, study blocks, storage facilities, docks, utilities, ship repair enterprises, social and cultural facilities, and housing. If the forces are rebased similar structures must be erected in the new place. Common sense suggests that such facts must be borne in mind when interstate agreements are signed.

[Gromak] One can just imagine the feelings of people who are becoming, as it were, hostages to decisions in which they have no say...

[Yegorov] Not long ago I met with USSR Defense Minister Marshal of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov and reported to him on the situation. The instructions I received from the minister show that people's fates are at the center of attention of the Armed Forces leadership and will be decided carefully, taking account of their vitally important interests. Our proposals on social protection for servicemen, their families, and workers and employees of naval enterprises were also conveyed to the minister. They were received with understanding.

[Gromak] Can the problems associated with a withdrawal be partly resolved through the ongoing cuts in the Armed Forces, specifically in the Baltic Fleet?

[Yegorov] These are different processes which it is difficult to link together. The reduction in the forces of our oldest fleet is taking place within the planned framework of the Soviet military doctrine of defense sufficiency adopted several years ago. For example, missile submarines have been withdrawn from the fleet, and the withdrawal of obsolete designs of ship is continuing, with no replacement by analogous new designs. The scale of exercises by the fleet's forces and of the fleet's combat training activities has been reduced. All this is in line with the radical reform which is starting in the Armed Forces.

[Gromak] Be that as it may, the fleet still faces important tasks...

[Yegorov] Nobody has relieved us of the task of ensuring our defense capability. Therefore, the main efforts of commanders and staffs are being channeled into ending the training year with high-quality performances and enhancing the combat readiness of the fleet's forces. I will say bluntly that here one can sometimes encounter professional apathy among a section of officer personnel. It is quite an important task to prepare for the winter and complete the plan for capital construction of housing and providing everyday amenities for personnel. All this presupposes intensive labor.

Army Soldier 'Mainly a Worker and a Peasant'

PM1710140791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Article by Gennadiy Miranovich under new "View From Editorial Office" rubric: "Did the State Committee for the State of Emergency Help the Army?"; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] We offer a new rubric. Henceforth, you will regularly meet KRASNAYA ZVEZDA journalists under this "flag." What will be discussed? Whatever is particularly important and topical in our cruel times. Whatever has caused alarm, pain, and concern in people's hearts. Whatever has gladdened and given rise to hope. Whatever has passed through feeling and been illumined by personal opinion.

Did the State Committee for the State of Emergency help the Army?

Reader, do not be surprised at this formulation of the question. For surely you have probably noticed that since the August events there has been less black paint in the wide and quite multicolored spectrum of opinions on the Army. No one is demanding now, as they did before the putsch, an end to combat training because in organizing it murdering commanders permit (would you believe it!) a certain percentage of injuries and even deaths to occur. Bans on guard service (also fraught with dangerous surprises) are no longer to be heard from all sorts of "experts"... That is, the Army is finally being permitted, as it were, to do what it is called upon to do by the sweat of its brow—to learn to defend the homeland.

Yes, after such active defamation of the Army on the one hand and clumsy attempts to "defend" it on the other, we have all suddenly remembered: What are we to do with it, our own Army? True, in the republics which are now working out versions of their own armed forces people are already wondering whether to keep the Army unified. But to achieve this was it really necessary to experience the State Committee for the State of Emergency? Or, without the blood shed by it, would we have never arrived at an understanding of the fact that name-calling and the constant imposition on the Army of functions that do not properly belong to it, as it is customary to say, end in no good?

For the sake of objectivity it should be pointed out that even before the "victory of democracy" there was no shortage of sober reflections on the Army's fate. After the rubric "Military Reform: Problems, Proposals" appeared in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's pages in February last year, this newspaper alone received more than 1,000 anxious or even simply challenging letters. For various reasons, including the newspaper's departmental blinders, they were not all published, unfortunately. And how many thoughtful letters and tearful letters got stuck in the desks of other offices? God grant, as the saying goes, that today, when it has been officially announced that the military reform (did the State Committee for the State of Emergency help after all?) has begun in our country and when the committees and commissions set up to implement it are already operating, some of the new desk chiefs will take an interest in them.

I am speaking of this because in the past, too, Moscow would ask for the opinion of the "grass roots." On the drafts of the military reform concept, the general military regulations, the laws on defense and on the status of servicemen... What was the point? While the country was changing, the Army remained within the old organizational structures. Deliberately, as certain political experts who, in my opinion, are out of touch with life now maintain, or not deliberately, the USSR Supreme Soviet's examination of the package of laws on defense issues was dragged out, but the fact remains that to this day the Army's daily life is governed by a whole range of documents which smack of yesterday. Our servicemen have no status. The military regulations do not accord with the realities of the day. There is no military oath which a soldier or officer can take without having to choose between an order, his conscience, and the law.

True, after the putsch, having heard the new USSR defense minister's firm promise that our Army will never raise its hand against its own people, it is possible to breathe a certain sigh of relief. Particularly as in Dubossary, for example, we have already gotten specific confirmation of this. At least some clarity has ensued. But do these words of the minister really not need protection consecrated by the law? Where is the guarantee that some new state committee will not again confront the Army and its minister with a choice: to fire or not to fire?

People are now talking a lot about the need more quickly to make the Army professional. Including those who only recently would have fought this to the death. Well, life goes its own way. Even some experiments which seemed promising yesterday today appear almost an anachronism. Like, say, the experiment involving service under contract for seamen and petty officers. Why spend money on the experiment, people in the Navy believe, if the question of contract service for all who wish it is already on the agenda?

I do not know how these and other complex questions will be resolved, given the hundreds of thousands of homeless officers, the undermanning of many regiments and divisions, and the lack of an infrastructure capable of ensuring their normal training. Will it be possible to maintain the trend toward seeking unity in views on defense? It is probably possible to say just one thing today with a degree of certainty: You cannot use a whip to urge on the military reform and the lawmaking process associated with its implementation. A great deal, a very great deal here still has to be clarified and settled before the interesting intentions that now exist in the USSR Ministry of Defense and in the republics become reality. And in this connection an equally difficult question arises, so it seems to me: What is to be done with the Army that we have? Who right now will protect the man in shoulderboards, for example, from being used endlessly to stop up all kinds of holes in the collapsing national—or now no one's—economy?

The State Committee for the State of Emergency did not help us in this regard, as God sees. So why these post-putsch arguments about reviving the prestige of military service and officers' valor and honor when the majority of our Army still wields, just as before, agricultural implements? Well, is there another field where an officer can display valor just as in the "field" of combat training? For, to be honest, he has been rather "tarnished" because he has begun entering potato and grain fields instead of fields of exercises.

Lately radio broadcasts for servicemen have often featured a song reminding them that grain is the most important thing. A sincere song. Only for some reason it reminds me of the press conference at which Marshal of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov told journalists how, during a meeting with the French defense minister, they started talking about the participation of servicemen in harvest work. Well, for a long time the Frenchman could not understand what was being said. But then, when he did understand, he remarked that in his country the grain is harvested by the person who sows it. Such a simple solution to the problem, you see.

But if you want to know what our soldier thinks about this—and in our country he is now mainly a worker and a peasant—I can cite the following fact. One of the first questions that is asked by those who would like to serve under contract is this: "Will we be involved in economic work?"

It is probably possible to give these future professionals an unequivocal reply. Their present state was defined very accurately, in my view, in an in interview in our newspaper with Lieutenant General V. Toporov, the new commander of Moscow Military District: "People yearn for well organized combat training..."

I understand the commander. The new training year is not far off. How will it begin? The same way as the present one is ending—at the capital's vegetable bases and in Moscow Oblast's potato fields?..

Commentary Justifies Nuclear Testing Moratorium

LD1510043391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 13 Oct 91

[Commentary by Radio Moscow military observer Sergey Kozlov—first paragraph is announcer's introduction; Kozlov speaks in Russian fading to announcer-read report in English]

[Excerpts] Today Soviet and foreign pressmen start their week-long acquaintance with the nuclear testing ground in Semipalatinsk. It is already closed. For the whole year this country will suspend nuclear testing following the declared moratorium. Our commentary is by Radio Moscow's military observer, Sergey Kozlov. [passage omitted]

Is this restraint justified from the military point of view? I am sure it is, Sergey Kozlov says, primarily because nuclear tests are expensive—every explosion costs millions of rubles. The Defense Ministry needs this money to solve the acute social problems of the Soviet servicemen who are returning from eastern Europe, and soon will return from the Baltic states.

I am sure the moratorium will not affect the country's strategic security, because the program of modernizing nuclear weapons at the age of their elimination, both in this country and in the United States, is becoming a vestige of the cold war period, a vestige which is as dangerous as it is useless. As to the existing warheads, the Soviet scientists claim they could be tested even without explosions. Militarily the Soviets' nuclear moratorium is a well-considered and necessary step.

Opinion Poll Concerning Nuclear Arms Control

OW1810080291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0721 GMT 18 Oct 91

[From "Viewpoint"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to the "DATA" News Agency, an opinion poll of 1,066 respondents in 14 Russian cities taken by the National Public Opinion Studies Center on October 12-13 found that 26 [percent] of them believe Soviet nuclear weapons should be under the control of either the Union president or the Union State Council.

18% said the control should be carried out by the republics where nuclear arms are stationed.

13% said the governments of all the republics of the former Soviet Union should be in charge of nuclear arms.

11% insisted that only Russia should perform the controlling function.

9% would like international organizations to oversee Soviet nuclear arsenals.

13% think nuclear weapons should be destroyed.

The rest found it difficult to answer.

Sampling error—3%.

Baltic Affairs

Troop Pullout 'Ultimatum' Deplored

PM1410143791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 91 pp 1, 2

[Article by military observer Vasiliy Izgarshev: "The Troops Are To Leave the Shores of the Baltic. But When and Where Will They Go?"]

[Text] There are demands from the shores of the Baltic, which only recently were called Soviet, for Soviet Army units to leave the former union republics, now independent states. And they are being made not by just anyone, but by the leaders of the countries, by statesmen.

Well, the demands cannot be described as illegitimate and unfair. But a withdrawal ultimatum too, gentlemen? Now let us see, how much time is there left before 1 December? Is it realistic to expect, say, a motorized rifle division to up and leave, board trains, and move its operations to somewhere 500-1,000 km away? And where is the division to be stationed? Where will the soldiers and the commanders live? And their families? Where will the children go to school? Where will they all go for medical treatment? Where will they get a wash?

Of course, it is the easiest thing in the world for the gentlemen who lead the Baltic republics to brush these questions aside. Nothing to do with us, they might say, we don't want to know; these are your problems, so you deal with them yourselves... But people do not behave like that in a civilized world. Indeed, is it proper to hurry in these matters?

Incidentally, I was told at the country's Defense Ministry that so far there have been no constructive talks on these matters, no agreements either. But we absolutely must have them. Our troops have a certain amount of property, buildings, and many other items of material value in those republics.

Are they to discard it all, leave it all behind, taking with them only their tents and field kitchens? And spend the winter in the Russian snows with no roof over their heads?

Now tell me who would agree to that! Let us behave reasonably, like good neighbors. Let us sit down and talk it over, as they used to say. We are bound to come to the right agreement, one taking into account the interests of all sides.

I know our side is prepared to do it. If it was prepared to recognize the Baltic countries' independence, to countenance their joining the world community, then I am sure it is perfectly possible to reach agreement on matters of mutual relations in the military sphere.

Given the desire to come to an agreement and not to confront one another nor to posture.

'Ultimatums' Viewed

PM1810082591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[V. Shmyganovskiy report: "They Entered Europe Through the Front Door"]

[Text] Helsinki—The leaders of the three independent states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have signed the CSCE Final Act. This took place in the same "Finlandia" Palace where the heads of 35 European countries, plus the United States and Canada, met in 1975. (The act now bears 41 signatures).

And so, "our" three former republics have entered the family of the peoples of the continent on an autonomous basis. Together with the others, their flags decorated the podium where the signing ceremony took place. Remember, the last time—quite recently—it was the Albanian President Ramiz Alia who mounted the podium.

A. Ruutel, A. Gorbunovs, and V. Landsbergis were welcomed by the hall not only as the leaders of newly independent countries but also as kindred spirits with great warmth toward one another. Finnish President M. Koivisto, who hosted the ceremony, noted that the Finns want to make whatever contribution they can to help achieve the aims that the Baltic countries have set themselves.

Commenting on the ceremony that was held, the press here is noting that the Baltic countries are faced with serious problems. One of these problems is the withdrawal of Soviet forces. According to assessments by Finnish experts, their contingent consists of up to 200,000 officers and men.

At a news conference all three leaders persistently expressed the idea of their immediate withdrawal from their territory and virtually called on the international community to exert pressure on the Soviet Union in this connection. Demands were made that this be done before the withdrawal of forces from Eastern European countries is completed. As is known, the Soviet Union has agreed to carry out the withdrawal by 1995, and this, according to the most sensible assessments, can be considered to be an acceptable and reasonable timeframe. As is known, the British Rhine Army, which is not numerous, intends to carry out its withdrawal from German territory over a period of seven years!

So the demand to carry out a similar operation with a more powerful contingent of troops this year cannot be considered realistic. And the world community will scarcely help here.

Another problem is posed by the ethnic minorities which in Latvia constitute almost half the population. And it was A. Gorbunovs who gave the clearest assurances that his country would give all minorities guarantees of equal rights.

...Having achieved what they wanted, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia could do their best not to quarrel with the former mother country—Russia—now that they have just entered Europe, and indeed through the front door. The period of romantic struggle must give way to a sound negotiating process—without ultimatums, unrealistic demands, and unrealizable time limits when it is a question of people's lives.

Council Representatives To Review Baltic Laws

OW1710192091 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1440 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Three groups of experts from the European Council will visit Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia from October 27 to 31 to inquire into whether the current legislation of these Baltic states meets West European human rights standards. The experts will pay particular attention to ethnic minorities.

The experts will present their findings to the parliamentary assembly of the European Council early next year. Alongside other documents this report will decide the issue whether Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia will be admitted in that international consultative organization of 25 European countries. The Baltic states applied for admission in the EC a month ago.

In Riga and Tallinn the European Council's experts will express their attitude to the draft constitutions of Latvia and Lithuania.

Estonia

Savisaar To Lead New Centrist Party

OW1410145091 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1330 GMT 14 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A BF's [BALTFAX's] correspondent reports from Tallinn that the new Popular Centrist Party emerged in Estonia. [as received] It is headed by Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar.

The party's program describes the party as "the party of Estonians" and the guarantor of stability" which supports small and medium businesses.

The program says that those willing to enter the party should answer in a written form if they have worked for the KGB in the past.

Among the founders of the party were several former members of the Estonian Popular Front which was led for a long time by Edgar Savisaar.

The creation of the popular centrist party marks the end of the Estonian Popular Front's "splitting" process. All in all, the Liberal Democratic, the Social Democratic, the Centrist Agrarian and the Popular Centrist Parties have come out of the Estonian Popular Front.

Government To Draft for Military Service

LD1810045191 Moscow TASS in English
1840 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn October 17 TASS—The Government of Estonia today issued a resolution on a call-up of draft-age young people. Under the resolution, about 3,500 youths will be drafted for active service in the period of October to March.

Their status remains uncertain, because the republican parliament has not up to now decided on the restoration of Estonian citizenship.

Neither is there a mechanism which would guarantee the implementation of call-up plans.

It is not clear which will be the duration of active service and whether those who served in the Soviet Army should be considered as completing their military service term.

A governmental bill on universal military duty in Estonia is still in the developmental stage.

At the same time Jak Leimann, minister of economics, speaking at a briefing for journalists, made it clear that young people who would try to dodge the draft might be punished for that.

Soviet Officers Issue Address About Status

OW1810011691 Moscow INTERFAX in English
2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a meeting on October 16 the officers of the Tallinn Military Garrison issued an address to the leaders of the USSR, Russia and the USSR Defense Ministry concerning the status of the Soviet military servicemen stationed in Estonia.

The officers expressed hope that the future interstate treaty between Estonia and the USSR will determine the status of Soviet military servicemen as "citizens of the friendly state" and will grant them all civil rights except the rights to participate in Estonia's political life, to do the state service, to serve in the Estonian defense forces and to own large lots of land.

In connection with the increased cost of living in the republic, the officers asked the USSR Government to pay them compensation from the Union budget and in future to pay them salaries both in rubles and Estonia's currency. The same requests have been made in relation to the retired Soviet military servicemen who will remain in Estonia.

Bank Official Supports Russian Ruble Move

OW1710192291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1440 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The former president of the Bank of Estonia, Rein Otsason, has told BF [BALTFAX] that Boris Yeltsin's decision to mark banknotes issued in Russia is a "justified step Russia is fully entitled to."

Firstly, Otsason believes that "Russia has demonstrated its determination to protect its financial interests from the USSR State Bank and the republics planning to introduce their own money."

Otsason said that in a bid to compensate for the budget deficit the USSR State Bank was emitting heavy-amounts of cash. The republics, in the first place Russia, were faced with the need to provide the goods.

At the same time Otsason believes that Yeltsin's statement is a warning to those republics that are reluctant to conclude the financial treaty, which gives Russia a number of advantages. "I maintain close contact with the President of Russia's Central Bank G. Matukhin. He is in no hurry to introduce marked roubles or a republican currency."

Otsason believes that Estonia must carry out a monetary reform before Russia issues marked roubles, or simultaneously with that move. Technical preparations for the introduction of the Estonian currency are likely to be finalized by next summer or even sooner.

U.S. Seeks Information on Soviet Forces

OW1710214991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Estonian Foreign Minister Lennart Meri met with Linn Hanson, head of the American delegation for the Vienna talks on Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces in Europe on October 17 in Tallinn. According to Tiit Pruuli, a spokesman for the Estonian Foreign Ministry, Mr. Hanson spoke about the USSR's attempts to justify by all means the presence of its troops in the Baltics.

Enn Tupp, head of the Estonian parliamentary committee on defense who had attended the meeting told BF [BALTFAX] that Mr. Hanson wondered if Estonia could provide information about the Soviet forces transferred recently to the Baltics from Eastern Europe. However, the Estonian side said that it had no such information, but had the detailed data on troops permanently stationed in Estonia.

Mr. Tupp pointed out that Estonia does not plan to join NATO in the near future.

Diplomatic Ties Established With South Korea

OW1810004991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] South Korean special envoy Pak Chae-Han and Estonian Foreign Minister Lennart Meri signed a protocol establishing diplomatic relations between the two states on October 16 in Tallinn.

According to the Estonian Foreign Ministry press office, the South Korean delegation "was surprised at sufficiently high economic level of Estonia after 50 years of socialism". The delegation spoke in favor of broad economic relations with Estonia.

Latvia

Protests Against Citizenship Proposals

LD1510230391 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1830 GMT 12 Oct 91

[Text] Today in Doma Square there was a protest action entitled Latvia in Danger, organized by the Citizens' Congress Committee of Latvia. Those speaking at the meeting opposed the draft law by Juris Bojars, discussed by the Supreme Council of Latvia, and the draft law by Janis Lagzdins on citizenship. The speakers emphasized that citizenship of this state ought to be taken out only by those who lived here up to 1940 and their descendants, and that this Supreme Council, elected during the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] period, has no right at all to decide on the citizenship issue. The view was also heard at the meeting that the Supreme Council has not acted for the good of the Republic of Latvia; it is continuing genocide and (?is not distancing itself) at all from ex-communists.

Ints Calitis, who spent time in Siberia himself, was said to have voted for the "zero option". Opinions were expressed against the creation of a register of inhabitants and other resolutions were adopted in this connection.

(Janis Riba), commander of the Home Guard, announced that in his opinion the occupying armed forces of the Soviet Union could be withdrawn in two days, which is about as long as it took to introduce them. But the prolonged presence of the armed forces here in Latvia was explained by the necessity of their presence for the Supreme Council itself, because it could not support itself without that army. Unfortunately, in their speeches several orators not only expressed political opposition, but even uttered personal insults in respect of the leaders of the Supreme Council and the Council of Ministers. This could even be read on the placards.

Defense Official on Attending NATO Meeting

LD1610103691 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1000 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Excerpts] About 40 minutes ago, a Latvian delegation set off for Madrid. For the first time in the history of the NATO, representatives of the Baltic states are invited to take part in the organization's annual session. [passage omitted]

[Begin recording] [Seso] What is the aim of our delegation?

[Jundzis] Our aim is this: we simply want to know what this organization is concerned with, to try to influence its strategies, that is, in such a direction that it will also look after these states, and take into account those states that are not actually in this association. Second, in this context we could propose that a NATO information Bureau be opened in the Baltic states, at least in one of them. Then perhaps one of the most important aspects: we want to stress that for Latvia, and obviously for Estonia and Lithuania, it is extremely important to stabilize the situation as soon as possible to bring about the withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces. I think that NATO could also give us political support.

Finally, in our opinion it is important for use to attend, as a third party, the Vienna talks on disarmament, where the NATO countries are taking part on the one side and the Soviet Union on the other, especially in settling any further questions on disarmament in Europe.

[Seso] When can we expect you home?

[Jundzis] Work is in commissions first of all this week, two days of commission work, at this NATO session; on Monday and Tuesday the actual plenary sittings, and then we will return home on Wednesday or Thursday. [end recording]

Popular Front Chairman on Group's Functioning

OW1710192191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1440 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chairman of the Latvian Popular Front, Romuald Razhukas, has said he wants the republican Popular Front to continue functioning as a grass-roots movement. Interviewed by the newspaper "DIENA," Razhukas said that the Popular Front must stay as long as there is the republican Supreme Soviet.

Razhukas says that the dissolution of the Popular Front can destabilize the political situation in the republic.

In the wake of the declaration of Lithuania's independence some Latvian politicians, including the first deputy chairman of the Latvian parliament Dainis Ivans believe that the mission of the Popular Front is over and the movement should either disband itself or split into several political parties.

Lithuania

Vagnorius Assesses Japan, Korea Trip

OW1710134591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1040 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Lithuanian prime minister Gediminas Vagnorius is arriving in Tokyo for a 3-day visit today. On Friday [18 October] he'll meet with the Japanese prime minister Toshiki Kaifu. The two men will discuss economic cooperation between their countries. It's common knowledge that last week Japan restored diplomatic relations with Lithuania and other Baltic states.

On Saturday [19 October] Gediminas Vagnorius will go to South Korea, also for a 3-day visit. He'll confer with President No Tae-U. According to South Korea's foreign ministry, their discussions will concern economic cooperation. South Korea established diplomatic relations with Lithuania on October 14.

The Lithuanian delegation is going to Japan from Bangkok where its members attended the annual conference of the leaders of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Poll Examines Citizenship Options

LD1410082291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 11 Oct 91

[Text] Fifty-five percent of Lithuanian Russians and 52 percent of Poles have firmly made up their minds to take out Lithuanian citizenship. Nine per- cent of Russians and seven percent of Poles refuse to become citizens of the Republic of Lithuania. Over one-third of the Russian and Polish population are still undecided on that issue.

These are data released by the Sociological Laboratory of Vilnius University which carried out a public opinion poll among the non-Lithuanian population 17-20 September. The results of the poll indicate that 42 percent of the Russians who do not intend to acquire citizenship of Lithuania will, nevertheless, stay in the Republic. Fifteen percent, mostly young people, said they would leave Lithuania. Most of the Poles of that category—67 percent—will stay in Lithuania, and only seven percent will leave.

Commander Views Withdrawal Demands

PM1510154391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 91 p 1

[A. Khokhlov report: "Airborne Troops Frightened By the Thought of Home"]

[Text] Servicemen from the airborne troops division stationed in Kaunas have sent a letter to M. Gorbachev,

B. Yeltsin, and V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, protesting the Lithuanian authorities' demand that the troops leave the republic by 1 December 1991. The airborne troops and members of their families say that there is nowhere for them to go if they leave Lithuania—there are no military camps for enlisted men on Russian territory nor housing for officers and warrant officers.

We asked Lieutenant General Ye. Podkolzin, commander of the Airborne Troops, to comment:

"The Defense Ministry is ready to withdraw troops from independent Lithuania. But we do indeed have no accommodation for personnel. At a recent Defense Ministry Collegium session USSR Defense Minister Shaposhnikov said that we will be able to redeploy troop units from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia no earlier than 1994, when troops from the Western Group of Forces come home and have been accommodated."

Letter Sent to Landsbergis

LD1210032191 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 11 Oct 91

[By correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius October 11 TASS—"We are reserving the right to act independently, if our opinion is not taken into account," says a letter, sent by the Soviet airborne division deployed in Kaunas to Chairman of the Lithuanian Parliament Vytautas Landsbergis.

According to the letter, officers and their families do not want to leave Lithuania for the time being. Leaders of the three Baltic republics announced at their meeting on October 5 their intention to insist on the withdrawal of Soviet troops, deployed on their territory, by December 1. Paratrooper officers believe that the withdrawal of the division is just impossible, because there is neither accomodation, nor other conditions for them in the new area of deployment.

About a week ago the Lithuanian Parliament received a similar letter, signed by non-commissioned officers and officers of the Army division, deployed almost in the centre of the Lithuanian capital. Deputy Chairman of Lithuanian Parliament Ceslovas Stankevicius believes that this fact is one more proof of "the danger of the deployment of another country's troops" on the territory of the republic.

Moscow Blamed for Delays

OW1210213591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1630 GMT 12 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The press bureau of the Lithuanian Government has cited several instances where the USSR Interior Ministry failed to transfer some of its facilities to the republic as stipulated in relevant agreements.

Thus the Lithuanian Government has had a telegram from Maj.-Gen. N. Yukhno of the Soviet Army in which he says that at the moment "it is impossible to transfer the training centre of unit No. 7574 to the jurisdiction of Lithuania." In this connection Vice-Premier Zigmas Vaisvila sent a protest telegram to USSR Interior Minister V. Barannikov.

In his telegram Mr. Vaisvila also points out that the USSR Interior Ministry has still not begun to withdraw its brigade stationed in Sneckus, although this is stipulated by an agreement of September 7. He asks Mr. Barannikov to take immediate measures to fulfil the ministry's commitments.

Yesterday USSR Deputy Interior Minister B. Yarin promised the Lithuanian vice-premier that top-ranking officials at his ministry would shortly analyse the schedule for the withdrawal of its troops from the republic and would prepare it to be signed by both states as an official agreement. Mr. Yarin said that these officials had been given powers to handle these issues by the Soviet president himself.

Armed Forces Discussed in Vienna

OW1710215191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Algimantas Vaitkaitis, deputy general director of the Lithuanian Home Defense Department, has stated in Vienna that the Lithuanian armed forces will be only 1/5 of the Soviet troops stationed in the republic. Mr. Vaitkaitis spoke at tho 93rd session of the Council on Security and Disarmament in Europe taking place in Vienna. The session, which will end its work on October 18, has admitted Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia as members of that organization.

A Lithuanian representative said that the republic's armed forces will perform defense functions only.

The Council on Security and Disarmament in Europe has offered Lithuania help in preparation of military officers.

Resolution Anticipates 'Massive' Price Rises

LD1810030491 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius October 17 TASS—The Lithuanian press has published a government resolution on the index-linked minimum subsistence level in anticipation of massive prices increases towards the end of the year.

The resolution fixes minimum wages at 350 roubles and the lowest hourly rate—at 2.06 roubles. Starting from November 1, the minimum taxable wages at the main place of work will be set at 270 roubles. Minimum incomes of first-group invalids, not liable to taxation, are fixed at 420 roubles, of second-group invalids and families supporting three and more children—at 370 roubles.

The resolution informs the population that the wages of workers of budget-paid institutions will be increased by 40 per cent as of October 1. Wages of workers of state and joint-stock institutions will go up by the same amount. Pensions will be increased by 120 roubles, as of this month. Scholarships at higher educational establishments, specialised secondary and vocational schools, as well as social benefits will also be increased.

According to the resoltuion, the index-linked minimum subsistence wages have been fixed and other payments increased to promote the transfer to a market-based economy. Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius commented in recent statements that he planned to begin price liberalisation in November and that by the end of the year it would have affected prices of the majority of goods. The increase in payments, preceding the liberalisation of prices, should, in the opinion of the government, cushion the impact of the inevitable price increases for consumers. One can only guess whether or not the measure will be effective. It is clear, however, that the growth of prices will exceed 30 or 40 per cent.

Political Document With Belorussia Pending

OW1710130991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1040 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuania and Belorussia intend to sign a political document in Vilnius on October 24. This was agreed upon in a telephone conversation held on Wednesday between chairman of Lithuania's parliament Vytautas Landsbergis and his Belorussian counterpart Stanislav Shushkevich, the press secretary of Lithuania's parliament A. Azubalis told reporters in Vilnius today. He did not elaborate as to what kind of document it will be.

The proposed ceremony in Vilnius will be preceded by their meeting in Minsk on October 21.

Supreme Soviet

Deputies Meet Yeltsin, Propose Candidates

LD1710225491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin met representatives of deputies' factions today. During the conversation, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputies have proposed a number of candidatures for the post of republican prime minister: Vladimir Shumeyko, Nikolay Fedorov, Vladimir Ispravnikov, Yevgeniy Saburov, and Svyatoslav Fedorov. Yeltsin took deputies' opinions into consideration; however, he rejected the candidatures of Svyatoslav Fedorov and Yevgeniy Saburov straightaway, noting with regard to the last candidature that it will not be accepted by the republican Supreme Soviet. A Russian Information Agency correspondent has learned that deputies have voiced a number of claims to the RSFSR president. Boris Yeltsin has accepted the overwhelming majority of them.

Yeltsin, Parliament Disagree Over Elections

PM1710134391 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 1

["Commentator's Opinion" by Aleksandr Linkov: "Will the President Use His Veto?"]

[Text] Society is assimilating the statement by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis, who told people's deputies last Tuesday: Most likely President Boris Yeltsin will veto the Law on the Election of Heads of Administration, already adopted by the Supreme Soviet. An extraordinary event is at hand. This will be the first time such a thing has occurred. Although for the deputies it should not come as a surprise. After all, even during the discussion of the draft law, State Counsellor Sergey Shakray stubbornly argued to the members of the Supreme Soviet the need to postpone the elections until the spring of next year and combine them with the elections of local soviet deputies. When all the arguments had been exhausted and the majority of the deputies were still insisting on autumn elections, S. Shakray played his last trump card in favor of postponing such an election campaign: "The president will use his veto." Alas, this statement was received apathetically in the hall, or rather with mistrust, and did not have its proper effect. It succeeded only in putting back the election of heads of administration from the originally projected date of 24 November to 8 December.

And now State Secretary G. Burbulis, returning from brief consultations with the president, has quite definitely made this proposal. And so, the contradictions in parliament have come to a head: There is opposition between Boris Yeltsin and the Supreme Soviet. Why might the president resolve to take such a step as to use his veto, although probably realizing that it will provoke dissatisfaction among his supporters in the democratic camp just as among his outright opponents?

The fact that Supreme Soviet has adopted the decision to hold the elections of heads of administration is already to no small degree a blow to the presidential structures. At the present time heads of administration directly appointed by Boris Yeltsin have taken up their functions in some krays and oblasts. They are virtually all from his team, and intend to implement the president's decisions. Here and there these appointments have provoked dissatisfaction. The strengthening of executive power has led to conflict situations. You do not have to look far to find examples. Deputies of the Moscow City and St. Petersburg Soviets do not wish to hand over power to mayors elected by the people. And what can be said about the appointees? The proposed elections of the heads of administration already in their posts may be thwarted. Certain appointees from the president's team may simply not be elected.

But the deeper roots of the disagreements which have arisen can be seen elsewhere. According to the assessment of experts and analysts, the autumn elections of heads of administration will bring the Russian president dubious fruit. Of the 68 regions of Russia (including the republics belonging to the RSFSR) a victory for supporters of reform is probable in 12 regions. In 10 regions the victory of radical candidates is probable, but requires exceptional efforts. And in another 10, victory to the democratic forces is extremely unlikely. In the remaining 36 regions of Russia the victory of opponents of reforms, the forces that oppose the political course of the president and the Russian parliament, is virtually inevitable.

Such an election result would be tantamount to a political disaster, since it would inevitably entail unpredictable consequences for the fate of Russian statehood. This might provoke confrontation between local and central organs on virtually all questions of joint competence. Which would naturally lead purely and simply to a complete paralysis of power.

Today Boris Yeltsin returned to Moscow and resumes work. He is expected to make a statement shortly in parliament, where he will probably announce his final decision.

Parliament Rejects Election Delay Request

OW1710161691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After two hours of debates on Thursday [17 October], the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet turned down a draft resolution supporting Boris Yeltsin's call for delaying the election of chief administrators till next year.

IF's [INTERFAX] parliamentary correspondent reports that the acting Speaker of the Russian parliament Ruslan

Khasbulatov urged MPs [member of parliament] to take a compromise decision in response to a suggestion at the end of Thursday's sitting of the parliament.

The Supreme Soviet set up a conciliatory commission expected to prepare a new draft resolution on the matter by the end of Thursday's sitting of the parliament.

Yeltsin Sends Message to Session on Elections

LD1710213891 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—An effective administrative system is essential for success of economic and political reforms, Boris Yeltsin holds. The Russian president has sent an address to the Russian Federation's Supreme Council in connection with the Russian Federation's law "On the Election of Head of Administration".

The analysis of the political situation in provinces shows that regardless of political results of elections, there will inevitably be acute confrontation between the newly elected heads of administrations and councils of people's deputies elected earlier, and between different levels of state authorities in the Russian Federation. This will aggravate the crisis and lead to a paralysis of power in the republic, the address says.

It is emphasised in the document that fixing the time for the election of heads of administrations will damage the prestige of the Russian president and of the Russian Federation's Supreme Council. "By its decision of August 22, 1991, the Russian parliament granted the president the right to appoint heads of administrations, and the president has already used this right. A rapid change of the stance of the Russian Supreme Council makes people uncertain about future", says the address.

Yeltsin asked the Russian Federation's Supreme Council to discuss before October 17 "putting off the elections to 1992 and holding simultaneously elections to councils of people's deputies and elections of heads of administrations for a new term".

Deputies Fail To Agree on Local Elections

LD1810021791 Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 18 TASS—The Russian parliament on Thursday [17 October] failed to reach agreement on Russian President Boris Yeltsin's request to postpone elections of local administration heads scheduled for December 8, 1991 until a later date.

In his appeal to the legislature, Yeltsin stressed elections will result in "inevitable confrontation" between newly elected heads of administration and previously appointed officials.

He warned this will aggravate the economic crisis still further and lead to a paralysis of power. Furthermore, Yeltsin said from 300 million to 600 million roubles will be wasted on organising the election campaign.

The parliament was also addressed by Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy.

The session did not approve compromise proposals, including holding local elections from December 1991 till July 1992 in accordance with president's schedule.

The session set up a working commission to draw up a final resolution by October 18.

Shakhray Resigns Over Postponement Dispute

LD1810104491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Report by correspondent Yevgeniy Zherebenkov from Russian parliament building]

[Text] Today the Russian parliament has a joint sitting of the chambers in the White House. At the very beginning of the sitting, during a traditional preparation—statements from the floor, clarification of the agenda—passions ran high. This time the outburst was prompted by Sergey Shakhray, one of Yeltsin's closest allies and state adviser, who sensationally announced his resignation from the posts of chairman of the committee for legislation and member of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Sergey Shakhray's statement is linked with yesterday's decision by the Supreme Soviet to reject the Russian president's request to postpone the elections of heads of administrations from 8 December—the date set by parliament—to 1992, and to couple them to the elections to soviets of people's deputies. Well, in fact the president asked the parliament not to hamper him, at least for the time being, in forming an efficient local executive power which he would control. The parliament rejected this appeal and here is the first reaction.

Sergey Shakhray, one of the brightest personalities in the parliament, is leaving a senior parliamentary post. I think he will not be alone in reacting in such a way to the path of opposition to executive power, and an inevitable conflict with the president which the parliament has chosen.

It seems that not everything is alright within the Russian parliament. This can also be seen from the discussion—which seems to be a definitive discussion—of the law on indexing money income and savings of citizens, which has already been with parliament for a long time. This draft law has been under discussion in parliament since June; it has been awaited for a long time, especially in connection with the impending liberalization of prices. The law was passed without a hitch in the first reading, but when it came to adopting it it became clear that this law causes serious differences. Representatives of the government, who no doubt are aware of the situation, are against it.

Yesterday I attended a meeting between deputies and Russian Labor Minister Aleksandr Shokhin, and quite substantiated views were voiced there to the effect that such a law would not protect the population against inflation and, at the same time, would seriously complicate the implementation of economic reform. Well, in the view of quite a prominent economist, he who tries to stabilize the economy in conditions of indexation of income will be simply ridiculed by professionals. Economists have calculated that the implementation of this law will require billions of rubles, and the state has nowhere to get them from.

Deputies seem to have understood that the law is half-baked and, as a result the law was not adopted. A conciliation commission was set up; it will determine the future of this law.

Concluding the sitting before a break, Ruslan Khasbulatov, who chaired the sitting, said that the discussion has been not very nice, but of late this happens in parliament increasingly more often.

Labor Minister on Government's Reorganization

LD1810104391 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 18 Oct 91

[By correspondent Galina Vinnitskaya]

[Text] Moscow October 18 TASS—The Russian Government cannot cope with the economic situation in the republic, Russian Labour Minister Aleksandr Shokhin has stated. He met Russian legislators in the White House on Thursday after the evening sitting of parliament finished.

Shokhin agrees with the recent statement of the Russian president on the need to reorganise the government. In his opinion, the crisis facing the government can be overcome by forming another government, capable of carrying out real transformations in the national economy within the forthcoming 9 to 12 months, including the creation of conditions for its stabilisation. He believes one could count on stabilisation in the financial sphere on the next stage. The rouble will begin to function as currency with internal convertibility. Living standards will stop deteriorating, and inflation will be kept in check.

Shokhin believes the crisis should not be overcome slowly, which is fraught with catastrophe, but in the shortest possible time. A stable monetary system and the normal functioning of the rouble should become the final goal of the first stage, he believes. This should be preceded by the liberalisation of prices, the changing of the tax policy and its adjustment to high inflation, the changing of the mechanism of export regulation, i.e. the replacement of the licence mechanism with that of export taxation.

Interior Ministry Reports on Economic Crime

OW1610194791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1700 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The former managing director of the Istok association, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputy Artem Tarasov, obtained some time back a permit for exporting about 400,000 tons of oil products. The whereabouts of the 30 million dollars to pay for the operation are unknown—as stated Tuesday [15 October] at the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Republic by the people's deputy and leader of the USSR Interior Ministry's Board for Combating Organized Crime Aleksandr Gurov.

A. Gurov also announced facts and conclusions contained in the report prepared for the Russian Federation's leaders Yeltsin, Rutskoy, and Hasbulatov on crimes in economy. The analysis of his department shows the more wide-spread offences in that field are:

—setting up spurious structures which soon close or announce false bankruptcy to fix illegal financial operations;
—cooking bank payments documents;
—illegal transfer of capital abroad;
—smuggling valuable primary materials;
—tax evasion;
—involvement of representative or executive state bodies or officials in commercial activities.

Aleksandr Gurov explained that the present laws on property and enterprises and some others are mere declarations without any mechanism of enforcement. He suggested setting up a special parliamentary commission for a fundamental analysis of the situation in the economy.

Federation Affairs

Gorbachev, Yeltsin on Signing Economic Treaty

OW1710193191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

["Gorbachev and Yeltsin Harmonize Their Positions on Economic Treaty"—INTERFAX headline; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] presidents—Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin—have met in the Kremlin today, October 17, to discuss the signing the treaty on economic union coming tomorrow. According to the USSR president's press service, the talk was also attended by the Chairman of the Interrepublican Economic Committee Ivan Silayev.

Boris Yeltsin told later a group of parliamentary parties' spokesmen that full understanding had been reached on admitting new members to the economic union only with the leader of Radical Democrats Sergey Yushenkov who had attended. Yushenkov quoted Yeltsin concerning Gorbachev's acceptance of all amendments bearing on banking and budget aspects of the draft treaty.

The leader of the ROSSIYA parliamentary group Sergey Baburin told INTERFAX that Yeltsin was determined to sign the agreement.

The meeting with parliamentary parties also discussed the appointment of Russia's new premier. Five candidates were recommended: Economics Minister Saburov, deputy chairmen of the parliamentary Committee for the Economic Reform Vladimir Shumeiko and Vladimir Ispravnikov, Justice Minister Nikolay Fedorov, and the head of Eye Surgery Centre Svyatoslav Fedorov. The president said that Svyatoslav Fedorov was out for certain reasons, and Saburov had been rejected by the Supreme Soviet. He gave no comment on other candidates.

The parliamentary spokesmen urged the president to include in his report to the coming congress measures to strengthen the rouble, to reduce defence expenditure and state financing of industry.

Deputy Viktor Sheynev expressed a protest by a group of his colleagues against the executive power infringing on prerogatives of legislative bodies.

State Counselor Interviewed on Economic Treaty

PM1710135191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Oct 91 pp 1, 2

[Interview with S.M. Shakhray, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic deputy and state counselor on legal policy, by N. Garifullina under the rubric "Views and Stances;" place and date not given; first two paragraphs are Garifullina introduction: "Crossing the Rubicon"]

[Text] Only 10 days passed between the moment when 12 of the 15 republics reached consensus in Alma-Ata on the economic accord treaty and B.N. Yeltsin's confirmation on 11 October at the State Council session of Russia's readiness to sign it. However, these 10 days have thoroughly rocked not just our community but also the interested section of the world community. During the period linking these two events the euphoria sparked by the Alma-Ata meeting has been replaced in some minds by a total rejection of the future treaty. According to the BBC, Vice President A. Rutskoy, for example, has even described it as an "act of brigandage" against Russia.

The events of these 10 stormy days served as a starting point in my interview with S.M. Shakhray, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] deputy and state counselor on legal policy.

[Garifullina] Right now the most sensational and most discussed topic is the situation in the Russian corridors of power. A number of government members have tendered their resignations. Deputy Chairman Yevgeniy Saburov has been accused of allegedly acting off his own bat in initialing or endorsing the economic community treaty in Alma-Ata. Meanwhile the parliament, just like the government, has been actively opposing the treaty—until yesterday, when it suddenly approved the draft. Boris Nikolayevich informed the State Council that Russia is prepared to sign the treaty by 15 October. Sergey Mikhaylovich, what is behind all this?

[Shakhray] My answer could be divided into two parts: Are there any objective contradictions behind all these processes, and what is purely external and grafted on.

I will begin with the first. I believe that we will inevitably sign the economic community treaty. On the whole, it is a very important step, as I said at the session. What I proposed was that we must approve the treaty draft and try to eliminate the ambiguity in the interpretation of a number of articles so that there are no grounds for the claim that the treaty runs counter the Russian Federation's interests.

The problem lies in what path we choose for our future development. If we decide that to preserve the Union it is necessary, without delay, to embark on reforms in the Russian Federation, then the logic of economic development will force the republics—force in the positive sense of the word—to join in these reforms. Or we may prefer another option: Russia will have to put its programs and tasks to one side for the sake of the strategic task of preserving the Union. In that case it will be necessary swiftly, through joint efforts to create interrepublican coordination and other organs and proceed along this path. It will depend on our choice what government and legislation Russia will require, and what shape Union legislation and Union structures should take.

I believe that the pause which has occurred since the August events is linked with the attempt to resolve this question after all. The hour of choice, the hour of truth is now. Otherwise we will get embroiled in the self-same contradictions which existed prior to August, that is to say we will have on Russia's territory two governments, two presidents, and two parliaments whose decisions will apply to the same Russian citizens, to one and the same Russian economy. After all, formally, in legal terms other republics have declared that for them all this no longer has any significance, that they are independent, that they are autonomous, that Union property is their property, and they have appealed to the world community to recognize their new status.

You understand, of course, that diarchy is destructive, especially in conditions of economic crisis. It was the threat of the rebirth of the old apparatus structures of the center which seriously hampered the adoption of the draft treaty on the economic community.

[Garifullina] Was it for this reason that parliament opposed it?

[Shakhray] Yes. This is why both the deputies and the government have been afraid. There is a document signed by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev as long ago as 12 September when there were no conflicts yet, and even then he already vetoed the reorganization of any of the Union structures. It is true that formally, in legal terms, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers was disbanded by the congress, to be replaced by the Interrepublican Economic Committee. Meanwhile the Committee for the Operational Management of the National Economy is a nonconstitutional, temporary structure.

Speaking at the session, I proposed: Let's divide the issue as follows: Our attitude to the economic community treaty, and our fears as regards the rebirth of the bureaucratic structures of the Union. If we lay down that the old Union structures are not financed by Russia, that their decisions on its territory are in the nature of recommendations, and that Russia will both finance and recognize the decisions of the new economic community which will be set up with its participation, we will have surmounted a very important psychological barrier, moved on to the problem of the economic community as such, and minimized the diarchy situation.

In that case the attitude to the treaty on the economic community becomes relatively simple: The draft is approved, as it has just been approved by the Supreme Soviet; a working group to prepare the treaty for ratification is set up; and the president, who is charged under the Constitution with conducting interrepublic and international negotiations, is given a number of recommendations on finalizing the text.

What has evoked suspicion in the text and, in my opinion for objective reasons, is still evoking the suspicion of the Russian Federation? The main and most important debate has revolved around what should be done first: Should a number of political principles be agreed, and the economic union concluded later, or should policy-making be put off, while concentrating on the economy? In actual fact it is impossible to separate the two. The interrepublican, interstate treaty on economic accord is above all a political treaty, but with an economic theme. And the parliament recommended to the president that he should first, or possibly simultaneously, define a number of interstate and political principles, and then conclude the treaty on the economic community.

[Garifullina] Are you talking about a political union?

[Shakhray] No, I am not. But if we are agreeing to overcoming the crisis and moving toward the market together, mainly and primarily on account of Russia's economic assistance, the legitimate question arises: For what purpose is this economic assistance going to be used? And it is certainly not necessary to dictate what the system and the state organs should be like. It is sufficient to stipulate that this economic assistance cannot be used for training an army to attack Russia, for example—and this essentially is one point contained in the treaty on the unity of arms, especially strategic arms, without which the international community will not recognize us. Further points must be incorporated on foreign policy organs, on our attitude to the United Nations—whether we will seek entry separately or, despite everything, will act in unison... That is to say, it is necessary to reach agreement on five to seven points and, having agreed, enter the common economic space.

[Garifullina] What else is seriously worrying deputies in the treaty?

[Shakhray] The fact that Russia has one vote, just like any other republic, in the solution of any question. The parity principle. But while this is absolutely correct and could not be otherwise in state and political structures, when it comes to economic organs, the interbank union for example, and other economic structures, this question is much less clear-cut. If we decide on one vote and parity, then expenditure must also be on a par. One million from Russia, 1 million from the Ukraine, 1 million from Kazakhstan, and 1 million from any other republic.

If we say that two-thirds of the expenditure as regards economic potential is to be borne by Russia, then, clearly, the statutes of the interbank union and other economic organs must specify that Russia has 50, 55, or 60 percent of the votes. No one in Europe objects to the fact that the FRG has 82 votes while Luxembourg has only 2, and no one is saying that sovereignty has been infringed. It is merely a realistic recognition of different economic potentials and different contributions. Meanwhile our treaty contains a contradiction: Russia has one vote, yet the budget of the future economic community is formed according to the national product or gross income, and, although the word "proportionately" is not spelled out, it is there between the lines. There is also a mention of reserve assistance funds for regions which are lagging behind, which are in a more difficult economic position. The parliament takes the view that economic assistance funds are better formed on a bilateral basis. Because on the basis of an arithmetic majority of votes it is possible to take Russian resources and redistribute them in any way you like. Russia is not against providing assistance, but let us do it on reciprocal terms rather than turning Russia into a bottomless barrel.

One more circumstance is causing concern. The entire treaty is based on references, that is to say norms of a referential nature are used: "Such and such will be regulated by a special agreement..." There are a dozen or more such "special agreements." Therefore, the stance of the Russian Government and parliament is understandable: Let's sign these special agreements simultaneously with the treaty, or at least discuss the principles on which they are based. We are signing a paper now, and when we sit down to the agreements we will tear it up, we will let down our peoples, we will let down each other, because we will not be able to agree on anything in the "special agreements."

We are told: There is no time, the boat is leaving. However, the outline plan contained in the treaty envisages several stages: initialing, signing, preparation of special agreements, ratification. A six-month process, as a minimum. Therefore, the Russian parliament's decision contains the following point: In parallel with the intensive continuation of the work on the treaty on the economic community, let us sign the "urgency" agreements on fuel and food for the winter and a number of other matters. Thus, I believe, the parliament's approach is well-weighed and dictated by concern for the interests of the Russian Federation, the future Union, and the economic community.

Everything that I have said so far stems from a clash of interests, from natural differences at a moment of historic choice.

Now about the external aspect of the conflict.

[Garifullina] What is its underlying cause? Did the Russian Government oppose the Parliament, did it disagree with its stance?

[Shakhray] If you look at the text of the government's criticisms of the treaty, you will see that it is impossible to disagree with many of them, and that the parliament's decision is essentially an endorsement of the government's stance.

[Garifullina] In that case the "resignation parade" is incomprehensible...

[Shakhray] I am just coming to that. By dint of my job I have attended most of the Council of Ministers sessions of late. It is true that I found it very difficult to understand why, when the Russian Government ministers tried to obtain the text of the draft from Prime Minister Silayev, or the economy minister or his deputy (saying "This is a very important document, we also want to work on it") they kept being told—tomorrow, tomorrow... And then it suddenly emerges that Saburov has initialed some sort of a text in Alma-Ata.

Purely in human terms I understand the Russian ministers perfectly. If a representative of the Russian Government is attending negotiations, the government must know what stance he is taking. And it—the Russian Government—did not have this information. They started looking into the conferment of powers, and did not find a single document bestowing on Saburov the status of representative of the Russian side. Incidentally, this is a lesson for the future. We discussed this with Saburov last night. It is always necessary to have powers bestowed in writing, in the case of a mission of this importance. If the president is bestowing the powers, it is he who signs the document. If it is the government, a corresponding resolution is adopted. This is how the conflict arose.

[Garifullina] But what about the resignations...

[Shakhray] The resignations. Completed statements of resignation were submitted at the Council of Ministers session by Deputy Chairmen Gavrilov and Saburov. Different views can be taken of this, but in any case the first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers commented that it was a resignation coupled with promotion, that is to say a transfer to the Interrepublican Economic Committee to join Ivan Stepanovich Silayev. Incidentally, a resignation is a two-way process: It is not enough to tender a resignation; it also has to be accepted.

[Garifullova] Do you know how Boris Nikolayevich reacted to these resignations?

[Shakhray] As far as I know, the president of the Russian Federation has so far not taken any decision on this issue. Incidentally, this is a question concerning our political culture. However, I believe that everything superficial will pass, and that the essence of this type of conflict will stop agitating society.

[Garifullina] Are you saying that there is no crisis of power?

[Shakhray] I believe that there is no crisis of power because there is no power. There can be no crisis of something that does not exist.

[Garifullina] This is a very interesting and unexpected viewpoint. Can you elaborate?

[Shakhray] The Government of the Russian Federation has been in existence for 15 months, and most of this time it has functioned as an organ of—how can I put it—political opposition, without actual power. Eighty percent of the economic potential was administratively directly under Union Cabinet jurisdiction. In this situation the absence of the desired results in the Russian Government's work was understandable.

However, you might think that after 22 August the situation changed radically, and that the Russian Government controls everything now. I state with utmost responsibility that nothing has changed yet. Absolutely nothing! A number of papers have appeared, a number of instructions and resolutions have been issued to the effect that the Russian Government and ministries are taking over something from Union structures. Taking over! Yet 12 September Ivan Stepanovich in his capacity as chairman of the Committee for the Operational Management of the National Economy wrote: Nothing is to be taken, nothing is to be touched without my permission!

[Garifullina] Yes, the situation is this: Ivan Silayev in his new capacity is opposed to Ivan Silayev in his old capacity!..

[Shakhray] In my opinion, Ivan Stepanovich's new post is not to be envied. It is a very difficult post!.. Vestiges of the Union, vestiges of the economy... It is necessary to try to put the situation right, and he has not mastered the subject matter yet. Having changed his seat, he should have objectively embarked on creating power levers for himself. In our system power levers mean a redistribution of what remains, what is left over. Therefore, his veto is understandable in human terms, although it came as a shock for Russia, of course.

And so nothing has actually changed for the time being. Power is a commodity which Union structures no longer possess and Russian structures have not yet acquired. In the absence of a political decision on where we go from here, this decision must be taken by the president and parliament of Russia and the Union president, who at present is the only legitimate Union structure organ, since the Union Supreme Soviet is not working yet, there is no cabinet of ministers, and the interrepublican economic committee has not yet been created. That is to say, power **no longer exists** there, while here it **does not exist** yet. And it is this pause, exacerbated by interpersonal relations, which is agitating the public, of course.

[Garifullina] How will the situation develop further?

[Shakhray] Yesterday's session of the USSR State Council, the upcoming Congress of Russia's People's Deputies, and the session of the Union Supreme Soviet will, in my opinion, take off the pressure. The problem will be reduced to one thing: whether or not enough courage can be summoned to start the economic reform with unpopular measures. If it can, it seems to me, the population, or a large section of it, will at the moment back any resolute man who says: "It is necessary to do this, because it is advantageous both for Russia and the Union." And people will accept this. But if we remain at the level of popular statements: "Everything is not that desperate, the West won't let us starve,"—then both the first and the second are doomed, and so are the third.

I believe that the pause is coming to an end, and the next steps by the president and the parliaments of Russia and the Union will demonstrate this. Incidentally, the mere discussion of these issues has convinced Russia's parliament that currently there are three main problems—the economic community, the Union or Union Treaty, and the national-state system of Russia, since Russian regions are already beginning to catch fire. Everything else is secondary. However, if the parliament has already defined what is most important and has begun to attend to it, this alone inspires a certain optimism.

[Garifullina] How do you assess the alignment of forces at the upcoming Congress, what candidacies will be put forward for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman, and how will the Congress go in general?

[Shakhray] Here too there is a special phenomenon. On the one hand the alignment of forces has not changed because the people are the same, there are no new people, no one else has been elected...

[Garifullina] But the political situation has changed...

[Shakhray] Yes, the situation has changed. However, the fiasco with the Russian Federation's Constitution at the Supreme Soviet has shown that many deputies have failed to draw political conclusions from this. The deputy corps refused to discuss the draft constitution. No one is saying that it should be adopted in the present shape, but the refusal even to discuss the constitution around which there has been so much talk is an alarming symptom. Most probably the Congress will open, or rather continue, with the same alignment of political forces as its first stage ended with. I greatly fear that an impasse may arise during the election for Supreme Soviet chairman. Perhaps the solution lies in authorizing the Supreme Soviet to elect its chairman itself. We could replace one-half or one-fifth of the Supreme Soviet, introduce rotation (some people are no longer working, and there are in the order of 114 people instead of 126 in the chambers), authorize the Supreme Soviet itself to elect its chairman, and try at this forum not to torment ourselves or the people. Maybe that is a solution...

[Garifullina] Will your supporters again put forward your candidacy?

[Shakhray] For the time being I cannot give a clear-cut answer to this question since, you will understand, this is a rather important decision to make. My candidacy is most likely to arise if the Congress ends up in an impasse. That is to say, I will not seek power, but I am prepared to assist parliament should it need me.

[Garifullina] Between whom specifically is the main struggle likely to take place actually?

[Shakhray] Well, I think you know the answer to that question as well as I do. Ruslan Imranovich [Khasbulatov] has embarked on an election campaign—that is perfectly obvious. And Sergey Nikolayevich Baburin also. One of them here, the other gone to the Kurils...

[Garifullina] Are new figures likely to come to the fore?

[Shakhray] New figures? In principle—no. It seems that the following scenario is likely. The two rivals will once again try their strength and, if once again neither wins, I believe that they will have enough political tact and political courage to withdraw their candidacies. Then some neutral deputies may come forward. Or else the right to elect the chairman may be delegated to the Supreme Soviet.

I am pinning great hopes on the remaining two weeks, on the work of the parliamentary and territorial deputies' groups producing a concerted decision to ensure that the Congress is held speedily and efficiently.

[Garifullina] Sergey Mikhaylovich, what processes are currently under way in the democratic movement? I am referring to the "Democratic Russia" parliamentary groups. Is it true that a split has occurred in the democratic movement?

[Shakhray] It seems to me, although many deputies may disagree with me, that there cannot be a split in something that has never existed. The unity of the democratic movement and the democratic forces was never an organized unity. Political unity was achieved only during the solution of a number of political issues, essentially during voting. The democrats have one advantage: Their stance, despite all its shades of opinion to the left and the right, conicides with the thrust of democratic progress. In this lies their strength. On the other hand, the superiority of the centrist and right-wing factions lay in the fact that, while their ideas until recently did not coincide—how shall I put it—with the course of history, they were strong organizationally. Democrats, by contrast, are organizationally very weak, but their idea currently has society's backing. It was this that gave rise to the illusion that there was a block of democratic forces, which has even prompted people to speak of a democratic totalitarianism.

[Garifullina] But many people are truly alarmed about the birth of a new totalitarianism...

[Shakhray] I believe that democratic totalitarianism currently exists only in the Bolshevist utterances of certain democratic leaders. As a political substance it does not exist. This is probably a good thing.

[Garifullina] However, such a danger nonetheless exists, and authoritarianism is also beginning to rear its head...

[Shakhray] I will try to formulate my stance. When we speak about a trend toward totalitarianism, we are drawing a conclusion based on an analysis of quotations from the utterances of specific democratic and nondemocratic leaders. We will be able to speak of a real trend when we have analyzed the public movement—a movement which is to a greater or lesser degree a mass movement. I believe that in this context it is impossible to speak of a democratic totalitarianism.

Currently the dismantling of the old totalitarian systems is under way. A major section of society tends toward the opinion that it is necessary to support this movement because it indicates a solution. However, as soon as the situation changes, as soon as the economic or political winds change, the self-same society is ready to support a firm, strong hand—and that means totalitarianism and a movement in the opposite direction.

In our country there is no propertied middle class on which a state's stability is built. If I have something to lose—the fruits of my labor, my apartment, my family, my dacha, my car, my capital, in the good sense of the word, which I have earned and which I can hand on, my ideas, my books—I will be a buttress of the state and of a stable social order. But our society is what is is for the time being. And the politicians' wisdom must consist in realizing this and seeking a solution by civilized means rather than tormenting society yet again. Everything will hinge on privatization—not a barbaric, savage privatization at the level of a party apparatus which has now rallied, withdrawn into opposition, and essentially switched in its entirety to executive structures at the level of ministries and enterprise—but a privatization for the benefit of people.

[Garifullina] Nonetheless, privatization is already under way! Savage privatization, privatization which proceeds all but by way of seizure, but it is under way!

[Shakhray] You are right! But neither Gorbachev, nor Yeltsin, nor the Russian nor any other government has so far been able to summon enough strength to finally cross the Rubicon. This is because they fear society—they do not know how it will respond to the reforms or whether it may not sweep away the reformers themselves. This is the reason for the pause. The pause has dragged on. I understand that a good actor must be able to pause for a long time, but this pause has already turned into a deathly silence in certain areas.

And in this social context the threat of totalitarianism does exist. But it will not be either Bolshevik, or democratic, or counterdemocratic. It will be simply totalitarianism, based on social demagoguery, totalitarianism resembling fascism. This danger does exist.

[Garifullina] Sergey Mikhaylovich, you are a young scientist and a young politician. Both science and politics are a "journey into the unknown." Do you draw satisfaction from your work as a politician?

[Shakhray] Yes, and no. Satisfaction, if it is to be derived from end results, clearly still lies in the future. But in any event I live in hope.

And it is this hope, this optimism, combined with my youth which enables me at the moment to bear the burden of political struggle... the difficulties... and privations...

What I am doing now in practice has been the subject of my scientific work. I never thought that I could switch from the sphere of scientific fiction to the sphere of political realities. The work of the parliament, the multiparty system, legislative work—all this was part of my scientific work, and I have learned a very great deal in this respect. In any case, if life gives me the chance, I hope to be able to pass all this on to students one day. Once you have been a teacher, you remain one at heart.

[Garifullina] Do you believe that we will build a rule-of-law state?

[Shakhray] I do! But it is a long and difficult path. Incidentally, at the moment what is arguably President Yeltsin's most important decision has been lost from sight—and as far as I know, only Yu. Feofanov has drawn attention to this circumstance. It is possible that at the moment it is subject to ambivalent interpretations, but if everything goes normally it will be by these steps, from the viewpoint of a rule-of-law state, that our descendants will remember us. The president adopted a decision on the transfer of buildings to the courts... With a view to the establishment of a rule-of-law state, the division of powers, and a stable society, it is necessary to establish a strong judiciary to which you and I may turn to appeal against a bad decision, including a bad decision by the state. And a court which is not dependent on either Yeltsin or Gorbachev will decide in our favor by virtue of the fact that it is based on law.

[Garifullina] That would be wonderful. It would mean that no one could describe a person as a criminal prior to trial, "recommend" this or that punishment for people under investigation, or pass a decree by which an individual was declared guilty prior to trial...

[Shakhray] The court would annul any decision, decree, or law if it was at variance with the Constitution.

[Garifullina] Recently you introduced a very interesting and unexpected term—the "political Gulliverism syndrome." I have to admit that it intrigued me greatly. You probably apply it not only to the specific incident at a Supreme Soviet session sitting—I am referring to the not entirely proper utterances in which Ruslan Imranovich excels, incidentally—but also to other things. It has grown into a whole phenomenon already, it seems to me. Am I right?

[Shakhray] Yes, but I think this is a topic for our next interview—on political syndromes...

Yeltsin Addresses First Congress of Judges

LD1710132891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1203 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Speech by Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin to the "first congress of Russia's judges" in Moscow on 17 October—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed delegates to the first All-Russian Congress of Judges, esteemed guests:

First of all, I want to welcome you and to wish you success in your work at the first All-Russian Congress of Judges. I am convinced that it can and should adopt decisions which will make it possible to strengthen Russia's judicial system substantially. The pressing need for this is self-evident. The time when it was possible not to notice social conflicts and contradictions and to brush them aside has gone. The traditional, arbitrary approach, irrespective of whether it is underpinned by the despotism of a repressive state or by anarchy, is not working, either.

Our ever more complex society has an ever greater need for civilized regulatory mechanisms, of which the most important are the courts. It is clear that judicial bodies cannot cope with their tasks without serious reform. Unfortunately, only relatively recently has a possibility of serious change here emerged. It is especially important that things are done in a timely manner, without being dragged out for years and years.

The point of judicial reform is to remove the obsequious administration of justice. It was, indeed, an obedient instrument of the totalitarian system. Russian society, which is having its fill of sharp conflicts and contradictions, deserves effective mechanisms for settling matters equitably in strict accordance with the law. We see that the most important conditions for stability and a substantial guarantee of human rights can be found here, especially now that crime and violations of the law have become the modus vivendi of a considerable proportion of our citizens.

The strong court will help ensure an atmosphere of social calm and security during the reform period. It will become a serious guarantor of preserving the unity of Russia. I say this because we have now approached really deep, practical transformations in the economy. The August events and what ensued have radically altered the entire situation in the country. Many pillars of the unitary state have collapsed. There is no longer a center as such. There are still some remnants, but in the nearest future we shall help them to collapse as well.

The extent of fluctuations in the political line of a number of Union republics has grown significantly. This has been reflected negatively in the interrepublican process. Elements of confusion have emerged in the democratic movement. After the coup it was necessary to make urgent and profound changes to Russia's political line. It was not only impossible, but also impermissible, to act as intended before the coup, as we witnessed, say, during the presidential campaign. I can tell you that work to amend the Russian leadership's policy is now essentially complete. That was the purpose of the interval taken after the coup. The basic aims and the fundamental features of the presidential program remain in force, but significant amendments have been made, primarily to our tactics and to the character and consistency of our actions.

Let me note a number of fundamental points. First, there has been a thorough review of our stance with regard to the center. Before, we were compelled to gear ourselves to protracted, exhausting coexistence with it and to step-by-step reform. Now, the task is to dismantle as soon as possible the remnants of unitary, imperial structures and to create flexible, affordable interrepublican structures. We are taking an extremely serious attitude to this matter. I have already spoken, in a recent interview, about our decision to stop financing Union ministries, except for the three which we have delegated to the center, the Defense Ministry, the Railways Ministry, and the Nuclear Energy Ministry.

Second, Russia will never be the initiator of the disintegration of the Union. On the contrary, I consider it my duty to use every opportunity to create a community of sovereign states. Otherwise, Russians, both in Russia and outside its borders, will simply not understand us.

Third, the significant growth of centrifugal currents in the country has been a key factor in our actions. In these conditions, we intend to act in a way that ensures Russia's interests are reliably protected. The republic's leadership is examining measures to defend its economic sovereignty, particularly measures such as a possible ruble intervention in case of the introduction of national currencies, and so on.

Fourth, the new situation has forced us to make significant changes to the process of economic reforms. Above all, we needed to review our precoup perceptions of their pace and of the consistency of our actions.

The deep economic and social crisis requires resolute action to shorten as much as possible this period which is painful for society and the population's living standards, and to arrest the decline in essential production for the population. Intensive consultations on this range of issues were recently held. We are beginning to implement reforms in a way that is optimal for existing conditions.

The government, too, ought to be suited to the designated tasks. Consultations are under way on forming a government of national trust and on the candidacy of the prime minister. Several major decisions will be made very soon. The order in which various steps and measures will be taken will be promulgated during the forthcoming Congress of Russia's People's Deputies.

The establishment of new economic relations in Russia will foster a considerable number of collisions and will take on acute forms. We must expect this. Transformations within the economy are already producing major changes in society's structure. Social groups and strata whose interests fail to coincide are rapidly developing. It will not be simple to ensure that these interests are regulated and that a regime of social partnership is reached and that recurrences of class struggle are avoided.

I am convinced that a most important role in resolving this task will rest with the judicial bodies. Without a reliable judicial system, we will not succeed in protecting the enterpreneur or the farmer or hired labor. An effective judiciary is also needed to resolve the most complex interethnic problems and to protect democratic values.

The courts represent the highest authority in resolving contradictions between authorities, in particular between the institutions of legislative and executive authorities. In other words, it is now vitally essential to have courts which are accessible to everyone, equal for all, just and strong. The concept of judicial reform in Russia will be examined at the current Supreme Soviet session. It will become one of the most important constituent parts transforming all law protection activities in the republic. I believe this task, as well as the economic and political ones, is central. It is an acute task, because the militia, the procuracy, the investigative bodies and the courts are currently unable to protect the citizen's rights reliabily.

I am extremely alarmed at the poverty, the level of competence and the clear decline of the prestige of these bodies. The reasons for this are well known: the hard conditions of work, the poor state of technical equipment and the low wages when set against the level of responsibility. It is not possible to remove these phenomena by cosmetic measures. What is essential is a radical transformation of all law protection bodies that operate before the courts are brought into play, that work for the courts and that work once the court process has run its course to implement the sentences and decisions that have been passed.

Judicial reform is impossible without adopting new codes. Work in this area has already started. State arbitrations have been transformed into arbitration courts. A law on the constitutional court of Russia has been approved. Its first members should be elected at the next congress of people's deputies.

The democratization of the judicial system in Russia is a very important principle of judicial reform, which should be strictly implemented. It implies, first of all, reliable and full-scale protection for judges themselves. Their activity should be secure against any kind of direct or indirect outside pressure. We staunchly support the idea of lifetime tenure for judges. They should be independent and act as individuals. The court is expected to guard common sense and humaneness, not some departmental interests.

Establishing judicial control at the early stages of a criminal trial is part of the democratization of the law enforcement system. The reform will invest the courts with the power to sanction arrests and other measures of procedural coercion. Citizens' complaints about bodies of criminal prosecution and differences between the investigator and the procurator will be examined by courts. Only in this way will we be able to arbitrariness and violations of citizens' rights by law enforcement bodies. Only in this way can their prestige be restored.

There is a pressing need to expand the rights and possibilities of the defense lawyers [advokatura] in defending the interests of those who require legal aid. We should overcome as soon as possible the common stereotype that confines the role of the defense lawyer to participation in the court trial and suggests that it is only the accused who requires the services of defense lawyers. The adequate status of the defense lawyer's activity, which consists in providing skilled defense of the rights of any citizen, is one of the most important features of a law-based state.

I believe that freeing the courts of relapses into accusatorial bias is a fundamental task of reform. We should give up the concept of the court as a punishing body. In connection with this, the issue of a special role for the procuracy arises. We see in it, primarily, a body which speaks in court on behalf of the state and defends the interests of the state.

This is not, however, a justification for this body to have a privileged position. A very important factor for a civilized and just court is equal opportunity and equal rights for all parties that come to court.

While speaking about reform of the courts, I cannot fail to dwell on a number of organizational points. I think that the proposal to create a federal court system deserves attention and support. In my opinion, Russian statehood in general cannot be real without the recognition of the higher jurisdiction of the court in the areas of the latter's competence. Without a strong and independent court authority, there will be no truly strong and effective legislative and executive authority in the Russian Federation. For that reason we are principled advocates of really strengthening the court and the organs of justice, through their decisive and cardinal reform.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the Justice Ministry has made a number of serious proposals to me concerning improvement of the work of the relevant bodies and improvement of material provision for their staff. These are currently being considered, and the necessary enforceable enactments will be adopted. May I once again wish you success in your work.

Esteemed delegates of the congress, esteemed guests, of course, I could not fail to bring with me some sort of element of justice. So, today I have signed a decision, and I will read it out.

With the aim of improving the material provisions for staff of the courts and notary offices, in accordance with congress resolutions, I decree:

First, that Russia's Council of Ministers is to examine the matter of increasing material provision for judges and state notaries of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, with a view to establishing salaries for chairmen of supreme courts of republics which are part of the Russian Federation and those of kray, oblast, okrug, town and rayon courts, at the level of the salaries of heads of bodies of executive power in the corresponding territories. Salaries of other judges and notary office staff are to be determined with reference to the established salary level for chairmen of the relevant courts.

Second, increasing the pay of staff of People's Courts and state notary offices will begin on 1 January 1992.

[Signed] President Yeltsin
[Dated] 17 October

Speaks on Judicial Affairs

LD1710195191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1730 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with Russian President Boris Yeltsin, after his speech to the first All-Russian Congress of Judges, by Anatoliy Fedorov in Moscow on 17 October—recorded]

[Text] [Fedorov] Boris Nikolayevich, in our state, hard though it is to admit it, there has never been enough money for the legal administration system, including the judges. Is this not because in our legal system judges have found themselves in such a sorry plight, without rights, just like all of us, strictly speaking? What form do you think judicial reform should take?

[Yeltsin] In my speech just now at the first All-Russian Congress of Judges, I spoke about this main stage, so to speak, but more details were given in the two reports. Well, my opinion, if you want me to be very brief, is, first and foremost, that we must effectively ensure a true division of powers—legislative, executive, and judicial. At the moment, unfortunately, we do not have such a division. The second thing is that we must reject even the remnants of the totalitarian system and cease to influence, whether directly or indirectly, the courts, judges, and their verdicts. Third, we must, of course, materially improve the level of wages because at the moment it simply does not correspond in our society with the situation in which the judges now find themselves.

[Fedorov] Today, Boris Nikolayevich, you gave a fine present to the 200,000-strong contingent of Russian judges in the special decree which says that from 1 January of next year the wages of judicial workers will be increased, and fairly substantially, too. Perhaps, the main problems have been solved by this, but not everything, because the main thing is where to get the money, isn't it?

[Yeltsin] That's certainly true, but by arguing that way we shall never reach the judicial bodies. In all the decades since 1917, we have never had enough money, as you say, for the courts, for the law, and for the legal system. Somehow, at some time, we must solve this question, and no matter how hard it may be, we must, nevertheless, provide this not so great sum—this is fundamentally very political—to ensure that the wages of judges correspond to the wages of a worker in executive power, so that it is virtually the same.

This is very important. Therefore, there is no trouble here; everything has been calculated, and will already be included in the 1992 budget, since these sums were not envisaged in this year's budget.

[Fedorov] What is the situation with our courts? I have in mind the premises of these Palaces of Justice—everyone knows about them. You have signed a relevant decree or instruction on handing over former rayon and city party committee premises to courts. To date, however, this has been done only in 295 instances; that is, if things proceed at the same pace this will turn into yet another, let us say, protracted construction project and will take about 15 or 20 years to complete.

[Yeltsin] Well, I would not put it as only 295 but as already 295. This is exactly as many court premises as have been built over the last 15 years. So one cannot say that this is too little or nothing at all. But I agree, and I personally am not satisfied, either, with the way this instruction is being carried out. Well, it is being watered down in localities, other options are being looked into in order to somehow avoid the implementation of the instruction. I will persist. Today I received enough messages from participants in the congress where the concrete addresses are given of those places where bodies of executive power do not comply with the president's instruction. This is impermissible.

[Fedorov] There are proposals to introduce trial by jury and the institution of justice of the peace into our justice system. What is your attitude to this?

[Yeltsin] I can only welcome this. This is the most progressive kind of justice, and this is being incorporated into reform.

[Fedorov] Boris Nikolayevich, today you addressed more than 500 representatives of the body of judges. What would you like to tell the contingent of the Russian judiciary through the Mayak microphone today, on 17 October 1991?

[Yeltsin] Executive and legislative authorities will, of course, considerably step up their attention to courts, judges, and justice in all aspects and, later, in adopting and implementing reforms. On their part, they should show activity, increase their competence, and, the most important thing, should always be just, because, in my view, only God is more just than the judge.

[Fedorov] Should a judge be elected or appointed for life?

[Yeltsin] I think that judges should be appointed for life.

[Fedorov] But judges will only be able to dispense justice under the law if they feel fully secure. What a pretty pass we've reached—in courts judges and their families are simply threatened. How can justice be dispensed in such circumstances? I think that judges themselves must know that they will be reliably protected in law. That is the only way we're going to get anywhere in this life.

[Yeltsin] I agree from the point of view of both social protection and protection in the sense of law enforcement, so to speak. Judges must at least be protected as much as any other citizens. As for today's threats, they do not just apply to judges, but also to the president and other representatives of authority. Unfortunately society is in this sort of situation now. Of course the situation as a whole has to change. I think that by around the fall of next year the general political and economic situation will stabilize somewhat and people's standard of living will begin to improve. This will have a direct impact on law and order in this Russia of ours.

President Yeltsin Interviewed After 100 Days

LD1710222791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with Russian President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin by Dmitriy Kiselev in the Kremlin in Moscow on 17 October; from the "TV Inform" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Today it is exactly 100 days since Boris Yeltsin became the head of a Russia that has embarked on a path of accelerated democratization. One-hundred days is a landmark, but it is also an opportunity for a serious and impartial analysis of the actions of a leader who was elected to this important post by an overwhelming majority of Russian citizens.

[Kiselev] Boris Nikolayevich, today is the 100th day, and you are in Gorbachev's office. Behind you is the Russian tricolor. What does this signify?

[Yeltsin] It signifies that Russia's sovereignty has indeed made headway over these 100 days. It shows that for the first time in history the leader of Russia, his residence is in the Kremlin, a Russian Kremlin, and two flags fly over the Kremlin—the Union flag and Russia's. This signifies that Russia's statehood is growing, as it were, although it has not assumed its full form yet.

[Kiselev] What, in your view, are the main results of the 100 days, your main victories, and your main defeats, if there are any?

[Yeltsin] Briefly, I am not satisfied with the 100 days. The days which have passed have been few, and we have progressed too little. Or rather, many days have passed, but we have progressed too little.

[Kiselev] What actions do you regret to the extent that you would like to strike them out?

[Yeltsin] Of course, one would need to strike out the putsch.

[Kiselev] During these 100 days your rating and the rating of the Russian authorities have fallen. Now, according to polls at the center and a study of public opinion by Zaslavskaya, published in the MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI newspaper, 50 percent of the Russian people do not believe that you and your team are capable of extricating Russia from the crisis. Are you not afraid of the creation of an organized opposition on the basis of this?

[Yeltsin] In the first place, there is no need to fear the creation of an opposition. This is a normal thing for a civilized state. Second, a further drop in the ratings can be expected insofar as there will now be very well-considered, decisive steps to advance the reform process which are not very popular with the population today, but which will bear fruit in the middle of next year, or, at the latest, by the fall of next year, when stabilization will be under way.

[Kiselev] Today is the 100th day, and Russia is still without a government. When will it come, and who will head it?

[Yeltsin] It will be necessary to appoint a new government before the Congress of People's Deputies; that is, this month. The apparatus of the new government must be approximately half of that of the current one, as far as both the number of members and the senior staff are concerned. In other words, it must be somewhat reorganized. That is one thing. There are a number of candidates for the post of chairman of the Council of Ministers. All of them are being considered.

[Kiselev] Do you want to name the people who are under consideration?

[Yeltsin] I do not think it would be wise to do that now.

[Kiselev] The papers are full of reports criticizing you for appointing an apparatus which is reportedly blocking your actions. What would you say about this?

[Yeltsin] No, I do not think so. Thus, the State Council meeting held the other day passed off in an atmosphere of very good mutual understanding. The members of the council understood the president and the president understood the council members. The State Council took place in a very businesslike atmosphere. I do not see any opposition whatever there—on the contrary, I see their support: this team is united. I do not agree with the mass media views that even the monolith, such as the Yeltsin team, has cracked. No, there is no crack there. What can be said perhaps is that during the two weeks I was on holiday, there were some signs of it. But the crack was filled in on the very first day of my return from leave.

[Kiselev] To what extent will the borders of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] remain stable?

[Yeltsin] The external borders will be stable.

[Kiselev] What do you mean by external borders? Could you explain yourself?

[Yeltsin] The external contours of Russia.

[Kiselev] But Russian businessmen are now successfully registering their enterprises in the southern Kurils, for instance. What would you say about this? Does that mean that they are sensing the trends?

[Yeltsin] After all, we have declared that the Kuril Islands are a free zone. That is the first thing. Second, we are involved in a five-stage process of negotiations with Japan on the Kurils that I have proposed.

[Kiselev] Do you mean the five-stage plan for tackling the Kuril problem?

[Yeltsin] I mean the five-stage plan for discussing the Kuril problem.

[Kiselev] How have your relations with Gorbachev changed in these 100 days?

[Yeltsin] They have improved. Businesslike. They have not lost any of their principled nature. Nor is there anything in them detrimental to the sovereignty or the interests of the RSFSR. On the contrary.

[Kiselev] Many economists are forecasting hunger riots as early as this winter. What is your attitude to such forecasts?

[Yeltsin] I think that it is necessary to set up a presidential reserve food fund in order to extinguish any such possible manifestations by the population in particular places in Russia.

[Kiselev] You say a reserve fund, but nevertheless all that exists is a single Russian reserve. At present oil production is dropping sharply, and it emerges that there is already practically no gold. What reserves does Russia possess?

[Yeltsin] First, there still is some gold. It has, relatively speaking, decreased because certain people have been smuggling it across the borders, and this has amounted to almost 350 tonnes over a very short period of time. This has not been so for many years.

[Kiselev] Over what period of time has this occurred?

[Yeltsin] Over six months. Second, the day after tomorrow, or rather tomorrow, the economic treaty is to be signed, and as soon as it has been signed by the representatives of the republics and sovereign states, we shall be provided with real assistance from the West.

[Kiselev] Are you counting on this?

[Yeltsin] Yes, it is necessary now to count on it. We shall not be able to do without it.

[Kiselev] Here is the final question. For a long time you were in opposition and developed as a politician precisely in opposition. You now need to become a creator, that is to say, you must become a different Yeltsin. Are you ready for this? What changes have to take place within you for you to be able to be a creator?

[Yeltsin] Well, it is right what you have said. It is not the same. One has to be, as it were, a different person. An individual is an individual and he cannot be two persons. Therefore, it is necessary to change. It would of course be easier to criticize and it is considerably harder to be creative. At present I have been organizing things to the best of my ability, including my own work, precisely in this direction.

Yeltsin Discusses Republic's Situation

LD1810002791 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1955 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with Russian President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin by Oleg Poptsov, chairman of the All-Russian State TV and Radio Company; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Poptsov] I think that the most acute [word indistinct] aspect of today's discussion [word indistinct] Russia, a single Russia. How do you fit a single Russia as an integral state into the concept of a federal Russia?

[Yeltsin] I think that there are no differences of view or even inaccuracies in these formulations. Russia is whole and indivisible. Russia is a federal state. At the same time, however, you must not simply get into theoretical definitions of what is federal, on the one hand, and what is confederal, on the other. There is such a distance between them, sometimes a matter of decades and centuries. If (?there is to be) a Russian federation with elements of a confederation which derive from the sovereignty of the republics within the Russian Federation, this is a new Russian state entity, which is finally acquiring statehood. By the way, as far as the republics are concerned, there is much concern now as to their attitude and whether they are going to dismantle Russia. No. On the contrary, the republics inside Russia are somehow calmer now. They have passed through a very difficult stage of acquiring sovereignty. A process is now under way, a treaty is being concluded—a federal treaty, and with individual republics. There are no contradictions here.

[Poptsov] Are you not worried that in [word indistinct] of Russia, for instance the Don region and Siberia, trends are emerging whereby attempts to oppose the president's decisions regarding a change of administration is growing into a certain movement of protest calling for the formation of a separate republic?

[Yeltsin] There are such things. I have a political map of Russia on which little flags show—just as in wartime—where support is solid, where support is partial, where there is no support at all, and where there is something of a lack of support. There are these four gradations. This sort of political map of Russia does exist. Unfortunately, the south is opting out a little bit. But I think one should not over-dramatize the situation.

Do you think we want 100 percent support from everyone? Do you think we want everyone to carry the president aloft? Of course I have landed in a difficult situation, in difficult circumstances. In the first place, however, I knew what I was letting myself in for. I knew that the situation would not be easy. That was why I asked for two or two and a half years' credit of trust from the population. I was elected by the people. Therefore, in this respect I have great psychological aspirations...

[Poptsov, interrupting] Guarantees.

[Yeltsin] ... guarantees that one must carry out everything that was promised.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, I would like to say that you have always been an advocate of a fairly active workers movement. You remember the situation with the miners, when you said that the working class had the right to choose its own guidelines for action. Therefore, we should now heed this definition. A (?fantastic) situation is developing today. From 21 to 26 October the trade unions, the independent trade unions of Russia, intend to hold a campaign, a campaign of vigorous actions, with the slogan of reform, the demand for reform. They are not opposing reform, they are demanding reform, privatization, and a market. They are not saying in so many words that if we are going to let prices float freely, then wage funds must also be unfrozen. At any rate, however, they are demanding land reform. This is not a struggle against the government and not a struggle against executive power. This is a completely different tactic. This is a demand of the authorities that they begin to take action at last, that they start carrying out their outline plans. How do you view this phenonemon now?

[Yeltsin] Well, in the first place, I do not consider that there should be complete unanimity. It is ridiculous to suggest that we will always agree with everyone and think the same way. We had unanimity and identical ways of thinking for over 70 years. The purpose of this (?mission) is understood by everyone now. Therefore, [words indistinct] things, to create pluralism, the struggle of different views. That must exist.

On 12 October I met representatives of Democratic Russia, representatives of the democratic bloc in parliament, and various representatives of the parties. We had a very interesting conversation. We did not agree on everything. At times there was even some tough talking. But, ultimately, all these endeavors are really aimed at one thing—seeking ways of implementing reform as soon as possible.

Indeed, I repeat, we simply have not been given a chance to implement them. Therefore, it was very difficult. I consider that the actions of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions are, in this respect, very logical and correct. As president the only way I shall respond to these actions is by ...[changes thought] We really will act much more energetically now to implement reform than we have done hitherto. This will be apparent during the next few weeks, literally. Our actions will include liberalization of prices. We intend to let prices go free, straight away. Only in this way can we extricate ourselves in some way from this hole. If we proceed in such small steps, this may reproduce the Polish situation. For seven years they proceeded in small steps until last year they finally decided to free prices completely. Yes, (?there will be) suffering. Yes, it will be difficult for the population. Yes, we must help the low-paid ...

[Poptsov, interrupting] Provide them with social protection.

[Yeltsin] Yes, a proportion of the population must be socially protected in some way. So, this must definitely be done. We must free prices in one fell swoop, survive for half a year, and then things will begin to stabilize, as is happening now, incidentally. Therefore the trade unions' demands are correct ones, and we will respond to these demands, as I, the president, and the government unquestionably [word indistinct].

[Poptsov] Clearly [words indistinct] to go away from conflict, then come back and again encounter conflict. Maybe this [words indistinct]. As you know, passions rose in your absence—not without the assistance of the mass media, of course. They reacted to this. Conflict was already [words indistinct]—between the parliament, the government, and the president. Boris Nikolayevich, was the fact that some [word indistinct] is bound to be exposed in these structures a surprise for you? Was this a surprise for you?

[Yeltsin] No, I thought [words indistinct]—well, a few things were a little unpleasant. The behavior of certain leaders, comrades-in-arms, is surprising. But on the whole the process is bound to be like that. The president went off for two weeks. They all want to make more of a mark, you see, without coordinating their actions among themselves. So certain unethical mutual attacks took place. I think the events were not as they were described in some sections of the media. Yeltsin's team is monolithic. There are no splits of any kind.

We, the Yeltsin team, got together today and everyone expressed the same point of view. Yes, there are small nuances here and there, but nevertheless the support is complete for the president. That is very good and today we worked out a number, a whole batch of these serious programs about which I shall speak at the Congress of People's Deputies, addressing the people, first and foremost the Russians, our parliament, the Supreme Soviet, and the Congress of People's Deputies. There will be a political part there and an economic one, and a social, national, and other parts.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, this is the last question I want to ask you: I think we are witnessing changes in the climate of mutual relations between the two presidents, President Yeltsin and President Gorbachev. Are you satisfied with the contacts which by now have taken shape between you, or do you feel that there might be some sort of worsening of relations? What is your attitude to that, to a worsening of relations, to an improvement in relations? Because everyone is saying that Yeltsin is changing...

[Yeltsin, interrupting] Absolutely not.

[Poptsov] ... and that Gorbachev is changing and adapting.

[Yeltsin] Gorbachev is changing. The coup, I'd say, was a very sobering experience for him, and made him see all the processes through different eyes. He understood that without relying on democratization, on the Democrats, without truly decisive reforms, without putting an end to the CPSU structures, it will not be possible to go over to the base of a new society, it will not be possible. He wanted to preserve the one thing and the other and the third, both to introduce a market and to preserve the party, to preserve its structure, so that it could rule. No, things do not work like that.

That is why we had what happened after that—and that is not yet a finished process. I think we shall have to adopt a Russian decree to abolish the structures of the Russian Communist Party altogether, abolish them. So far I have only suspended it, while the investigation is under way. The investigation already has many materials, many grounds, but time will show this later. Meanwhile we have to abolish the structures altogether, the party structures, and thereby take the guilt away from the rank-and-file Communists, so that they are entitled to join any other party or, for instance the faction of the same party which is called...[Yeltsin hesitates]

[Poptsov] Communists for Democracy.

[Yeltsin] Communists for Democracy, and so on. So our relations now are generally businesslike. He often, almost daily, telephones and consults me on this or that issue.

He is not striving for any confrontation. But at the same time I, of course, am not losing my principled attitude and if there is any attempt on his part to put any pressure on Russia...

[Poptsov, interrupting] (?Stand up firmly to Gorbachev?)

[Yeltsin] Absolutely right. He will at once get an instantaneous retaliatory blow.

[Poptsov] Reaction.

[Yeltsin] Reaction?

[Poptsov] Let's call it reaction.

[Yeltsin] All right, reaction.

[Poptsov] Let's call it reaction. The final question, purely human, on behalf of the voters. Can we count on having a president's hour on television, when President Yeltsin answers television viewers' questions? I think that this kind of dialogue is necessary and it inspires belief that Russia has a president who is ready any time for dialogue with his [word indistinct].

[Yeltsin] Well, let us say I have been silent for two weeks and I already feel, I keep receiving reports: Why is the president silent, whether I have nothing to say, or something else. I have explained that this break was used for thinking about how we should act further and act to bring about results. Now we need action, action, and more action. Now we are going to have fewer political debates. They must be reduced to a minimum. The most important thing now is reform and the drafting of the relevant laws and decrees connected with reform and implementation of reform. There must be responsibility for implementation from top to bottom because this vertical line of executive authority is now being reconstructed. It did not exist. It had been destroyed and chopped up into pieces. It will now be fully built up.

[Poptsov] You seem to be in a good mood, and that counts for a great deal. So I'm grateful to you for the interview.

[Yeltsin] Thank you. I am an optimist in spite of everything, and I hope for the best. I hope changes will come, although we still have a certain difficult period to endure together with the people.

[Poptsov] Thank you.

Silayev Addresses Labor Union Congress

LD1710231691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Delegates to the Second Congress of the Interrepublican Union of Labor Kollektivs, which opened in Moscow today, intend, judging by the agenda, to come out with an initiative on the need to introduce changes to the existing legislation on questions of privatization and the rights of labor kollektivs. In the first speeches by delegates, it was emphasized that the process of the removal of state control over enterprises, which has begun in the country, is proceeding, in the main, in the interests of the existing power nomenklatura and to the detriment of citizens' property rights.

The property interests of kollektivs have not been protected from interaction between enterprises and foreign capital either. Some delegates at the congress expressed amazement over the fact that the leaders of the republics, including Russia, have not responded to the organizational committee's invitation about participating in a forum of the country's labor kollektivs.

The situation was partially clarified by Ivan Silayev, head of the Committee for the Operational Management of the National Economy, who spoke at the morning session. He stated, among other things, that the main unifying factor of the treaty on an economic community, which is expected to be signed tomorrow, is precisely recognition of the priority rights of enterprises and their labor kollektivs as an entity of economic activity. Silayev said that the Interrepublican Economic Committee [IEC], which is being created following the signing of the treaty, will consider its main function to be precisely that of attracting enterprises to normal market relations irrespective of their republican subordination.

Silayev dispelled the fears of a number of republics in relation to the fact that in this interrepublican structure Russia is allegedly claiming the role of legal successor of the former Union, stating that the headquarters of the IEC could be completely transferred, for example, to Minsk, if the majority of the republics consented to this. We in the future committee, the IEC chairman said, intend to oppose firmly the so-called nomenklatura privatization—in other words, changing the signs over all-Union structures which, in essence, would remain bureaucratic, superior to republican, despite the fact that they declare themselves to be all possible kinds of concerns, associations, and so on. Ivan Silayev's intention to carry out a reregistration of similar revamped all-Union ministries met with the approval of the congress delegates.

A report on the economic situation in Moscow, in particular the grave situation of enterprises of the military-industrial complex, was given at the congress by Moscow Deputy Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov. The congress of the Interrepublican Union of Labor Kollektivs will go on for three days.

Transferring of 'Sectoral' Ministries Announced

OW1810033291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[From the "Soviet Business News" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia has announced that transferring sectoral ministries and their subordinate enterprises on Russian territory under own authority. [sentence as received]

Among them are the following ministries:

—Air, defense, shipbuilding, electronic and radio industries; general engineering industry;

—Metallurgy, electrical technology and instrument-making industries, motor vehicle and agricultural machinery industry, chemical and oil industries:

And the following state committees:

—for consumer industry and for engineering.

Russia will likewise assume control of the state industrial associations, interrepublican state associations and concerns on its territory.

Departments to be established with the Russian industry minister will coordinate the work of these enterprises and associations.

Draft on Foreign Trade Intermediation Submitted

OW1810065991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 17 Oct 91

["Soviet Press on Business. KOMMERSANT, No. 41: 'Russia Will Lift the Ban on Foreign Trade Intermediation'"—INTERFAX headline; from the "Business Weekly" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Ministry for External Economic Ties (MEET) of the Russian Federation has submitted to Russia's Council of Ministers a draft of a decree named "On Liberalisation of External Economic Activities of Russian Enterprises."

The draft provides that beginning on November 1, 1991, all Russian enterprises registered with the MEET as participants in external economic activities will be granted the right to freely engage in foreign trade intermediation.

This will amount to rescinding the decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR of March 7, 1989, named "On State Regulation of External Economic Activities" which permitted nonstate-owned enterprises to export only the products they manufacture and import only their own inputs, and banned foreign trade intermediation.

Now enterprises and organisations will no longer have to specify what kind of products they are planning to export or import.

Experts predict that foreign trade liberalisation may lead to a sharp increase in foreign trade turnovers of Russian commercial enterprises even during the first month after the decree takes effect. The volumes of turnover may jump three to four times, with $10-15 million worth of goods being exported and $100-150 million worth of goods being imported monthly.

The draft also calls for simplified procedures of registration of enterprises as participants in external economic activities. From November 1 onwards, all Russian enterprises irrespective of their form of ownership will be registered as participants in external economic activities by the State Licencing Committee of the Russian Federation within not more than 15 days of application.

To be registered as a participant in external economic activities, an enterprise should submit to the State Licencing Committee a written application for registration, notarially attested copies of documents certifying that the enterprise has been registered as legal entity, and a copy of a bank's certificate of payment of the registration duty.

The introduction of the new procedure for registration of participants in external economic activities does not invalidate the registration certificates already issued to enterprises by the MEET of the USSR and the MEET of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

Lopatin: Defense Committee Not Yet Active

PM1810110291 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Colonel V. Lopatin, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, State Committee for Defense Questions, by Captain 3d Rank V. Yermolin under the "Viewpoint" rubric; place and date not given: "USSR People's Deputy Col. V. Lopatin: The RSFSR State Committee for Defense Questions Exists Only on Paper"]

[Text] [Yermolin] Vladimir Nikolayevich, since last fall you have been one of those who are directly involved, by virtue of your post as deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] State Committee for Defense Questions, in the formation of Russia's defense structures. The situation today is such that each of the former Union republics not only has its own view of the future of the present USSR Armed Forces, but is beginning to take certain practical steps in that direction. What is Russia's position?

[Lopatin] Russia has a leading role in defense questions. Or rather, it should have. Suffice it to say that Russia bears two-thirds of all military expenditure, has 80 percent of all enterprises in the military-industrial complex, and is the main supplier of equipment and material resources for the Army. Therefore we certainly have a legitimate right to say that our role in the reform of defense and the Armed Forces should be a leading role.

After all, the Union's national-state structure has changed. We are now moving from a federation toward a confederation, with secession by some of the states. All this time defense, as a part of the state machine, has remained unchanged. A conflict arose which all 15 republics tried unsuccessfully, for two and a half years, to resolve with the Defense Ministry. After which some of the republics decided to take power for themselves in the defense sphere, and some of them, including Russia, decided to start a dialogue at interrepublic level and seek a way out of the situation not individually, but jointly. And so the initiative was born for the meeting in July of this year in Kiev, where Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia declared the unity of their positions. A representative of Uzbekistan was also at the meeting.

Then there was the Moscow meeting, at which representatives of all 15 states came together for the first time. Three views were expressed: in favor of preserving unified Armed Forces, in favor of creating joint Armed Forces, and the Baltic region (and later Georgia) came out in favor of the withdrawal of all Union troop formations from their territory. Russia proposed meeting around the conference table to coordinate positions. After all, everyone's aim is the same: to ensure that the process of the Armed Forces' transition from one status to another is a controlled and regulated process.

I hope everyone remembers that the Soviet Union is a nuclear power. The chaotic disintegration of our Army is a prospect that terrifies the world. But a month has passed, and there has been no initiative from the center in this direction. The committee for military reform remained a fine idea, not put into practice. Although we have a decision, a chairman.... As a result, only 11 republics met in October—without the Baltics. Yet the presence of Soviet Army units on its territory provides grounds for some collaboration. The Ukraine also did not take part, although I am convinced that on defense questions it is particularly important not to take decisions without taking the other republics' interests into account. Here improvisation mingled with political ambition is impermissible. Azerbaijan reversed its position entirely, declaring the nationalization of all military property and the formation of its own Army (whereas on 11 September it was in favor of unified Armed Forces).

In short, events are developing rapidly, and what was possible yesterday, but was not immediately put into practice on the basis of the republics' proposals, becomes impossible today, largely because of the center's sluggishness.

[Yermolin] Nowadays it is probably necessary to explain what you mean by the "center."

[Lopatin] By the center I mean what remains of the former Union, the former structures, including the USSR Defense Ministry.

[Yermolin] And the USSR State Council?

[Lopatin] In my view the State Council is a product of the new structures which want to become the new center. How realistic that is, only time will tell. As for the USSR Defense Ministry, unfortunately it is not noted for its flexibility, and its reaction to the processes taking place in the republics is rather slow. Which leads to uncoordinated actions. For instance, it is clear today that it is necessary to steer a course toward joint Armed Forces with a single command system for strategic and nuclear forces, but the ministry is still talking about maintaining unified Armed Forces. With this approach, by tomorrow even this will be hard to achieve. The latest interrepublic consultative meetings at the USSR Defense Ministry showed that they are marking time.

[Yermolin] But surely new people came to the USSR Defense Ministry after August?

[Lopatin] Yes, the defense minister was replac[illegible] There was hope of reform. But his entourage for the most part, remained the same in nature and content, despite a few reshuffles. And bearing in mind that "the servants make the king," the reform could easily remain unimplemented

Today it is vitally important for Russia to define its own place in defense policy and exercise the leading role for which its proportionate involvement in defense affairs creates the potential. Russia has not hitherto had a clear stance of its own on defense questions, nor the structures to form such a stance.

[Yermolin] What about your State Committee?

[Lopatin] The RSFSR State Committee for Defense Questions exist only on paper. There is the name, which has changed four times, there are successive chairmen, there are deputies who remain unchanged, there are a few staffers. But there is no committee. No, because the setting up of a real, effective committee is opposed in every possible way by the apparatus structures of the republic leadership. And this constantly affects the quality of the resolution of problems connected with Russia's defense. There are people who understand this work. And they have been doing this work for more than a year, but on a voluntary basis, in their free time. It is the story of the Russian KGB all over again, when, six months after being set up, it was represented among the defenders of the "White House" by a few staffers with two pistols and no communication with local organs.

The only difference in our case is that we are into our second year and we have no weapons at all! To do practical work, they should have signed an appropriate Council of Ministers resolution and appointed people who could—not on a voluntary basis, but professionally—represent Russia's interests in the formation of military policy and the implementation of military-economic and military-social programs. But we spent a whole year doing nothing but conduct a correspondence with Silayev's apparatus. When the president was elected, we waited for decrees from him. They never came. They told us that Silayev would again be tackling the matter. But Silayev delegated it to someone or other, and then he left anyway. As a result the question remains unresolved to this day.

The committee also does not exist because the increasing torrent of paper, instructions, and letters threatens to turn it into yet another bureaucratic structure engaged in correspondence, while many draft documents, analytical materials, and predictions drawn up here are never taken up and the work gets "binned." Thus, for instance, a document submitted to the republic leadership on 8 August this year spoke directly about the threat of a military coup in the country in August and proposed measures to prevent it. But yet again, it went unnoticed.... Another reason why there is no committee is probably the belief that Russia's interests will be represented by the USSR Defense Ministry. But that is unlikely, even if the committee chairman is USSR first deputy defense minister. He cannot make the weather by himself.

[Yermolin] So in your view, is Russia ready for its own defense ministry?

[Lopatin] Recently, during a meeting at the USSR Defense Ministry, the question of a Council of Defense Ministers was discussed. Marshal Shaposhnikov says it is a consultative organ. I agree that this organ should be collegial. But I see its status differently, as something rather bigger than merely a consultative body. The times demand this approach. What we need is not consultations, but a mechanism for adopting and implementing concrete decisions. That being so, it is also expedient to create a Russian Defense Ministry instead of the proclaimed State Committee for Defense. Only not on paper, but in practice. Rather than carrying on playing for the center when the game is already lost, it is better to start our own game in the interests of the emerging Russia and the security of our neighbors and the world.

[Yermolin] What should the priority measures be, in your view?

[Lopatin] There is still time this year to conclude a defense union, given the fulfillment of three main principles: the timing should not be linked to the signing of the Union treaty or any other political or economic agreement; the form and time scale of membership of the defense union should be as flexible as possible for each participant; and preparations should be made for integrating this union into a collective European security system. It could be done via bilateral and multilateral agreements. It must be done. In order to reduce all the differences to a common denominator both with those who want unified Armed Forces, and with those who want joint Armed Forces, and with those who want troops withdrawn from their states' territory. We have no time to spare. Soon the process of defense reform will turn into an uncontrolled process of disintegration of the Army, which will be disastrous for all republics of the Union, as well as dangerous to the entire world community.

Media

New Evangelical Christian Program Broadcasted

LD1810052891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 0710 GMT on 17 October broadcasts a 30-minute program on Evangelical Christians in Russia entitled "Russia's Awakening."

Radio Rossii announcer Yevgeniy Shomskiy first introduces the program by saying: "You are tuned into the Russian state radio channel. It is particularly important for me to emphasize that this is a state radio channel. As those of you who are regular listeners are aware, Radio Rossii is a new radio in many ways, and in many ways what goes on is not traditional on an ordinary radio station. It was not traditional for state radio when the first religious programs appeared here, on Radio Rossii. At first we only had one religious program. Now that we are on the air longer, around the clock, we have set up a group to make religious programs, and are now trying to meet the requirements of all denominations and all believers. A new program is now presented for you to judge. The author and presenter is Yuriy Korotkov. Perhaps those of you who listen to Mayak will know him for the Mayak 'Panorama.' He often presents these. Now he is appearing in a new capacity as the presenter of a religious program. The program is called 'Russia's Awakening' ['Probuzhdeniye Rossii'] and is about Protestant believers."

The program then begins, and is announced as "Russia's Awakening. A program for you from the Evangelical Christians." The presenters are Vera Mazur and Yuriy Korotkov. Korotkov says: "We are pleased to welcome you at this time, and offer you the first Protestant program in Russian history made on state radio by the believers themselves." An introduction is read by Presbyter Grigoriy Ivanovich Komendant, the chairman of the Union of Evangelical Christian-Baptists. Also taking part is the secretary of the Union, Presbyter Aleksandr Ivanovich Eresyuk.

The remainder of the program consists of a compilation of poetry, music, a meeting with Sunday school children, a personal tale of salvation from alcoholism, impotence, and depression through new-found membership in the Evangelical Christian-Baptist fellowship, a Bible reading, and a history of the development of protestantism said to cover "Baptists, Pentecostalists, Adventists, Lutherans, Mennonites, Reformers, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Quakers, Methodists, Sabbatarians, and many others," of which the first three are predominant in Russia.

Igor Vasilkov, Radio Rossii announcer at the end of the program, concludes: "I think—I do not think, but rather am sure—that this program for Protestant believers will undoubtedly find its place on the air. It will be going out fairly often. Listen to our previews."

Local Affairs

Chechen-Ingushetia Developments Updated

PM1710111791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Ali Kazikhanov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Prisoners Demand To Be Enrolled in People's Militia"]

[Text] Groznyy—In an atmosphere of strict secrecy Russian parliamentarians are conducting talks with the leaders of the National Chechen Congress Executive Committee.

At the same time the Executive Committee's supporters are continuing to hold a rally outside the House of Soviets. Armed formations of the "National Guard" have partly lifted the blockade of the republic television building. On 14 October representatives of another rally—supporters of the authorities—spoke here and urged television viewers not to participate in the election scheduled for 27 October.

One other event is at the center of attention in the republic—the mutiny at Groznyy Detention Center. A few days ago approximately 600 people broke down cell doors, emerged into the detention center's grounds, burned the library, the medical and sanitary section, and the storehouse, and attempted to break out of the jail. The guards were forced to open fire. Several prisoners were injured, and two killed. Nine fugitives have been discovered outside the jail. It is not yet known how many are still on the run, as the prisoners remain outside the cells. Their demands are for immediate release, as they were sentenced by the communist power, which no longer exists, and...for enrolment in the people's militia.

Staffers of the Chechen-Ingush Ministry of Internal Affairs, relatives, and representatives of the clergy are negotiating with the prisoners, albeit so far without results.

President Gamsakhurdia Issues Plea to Georgians

OW1710215691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Georgia's President Zviad Gamsakhurdia has called on the ethnic Georgians living in Chechen-Ingushetia to vote at the forthcoming presidential election in that republic in favor of Jokhar Dudayev, chairman of the Chechen People's Congress and retired aviation general.

Mr. Gamsakhurdia pointed out that the Georgians' duty is to support Dudayev's struggle for independence against imperialistic forces.

Tatar President Bans Quasi-Military Bodies

OW1810032491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The president of Tatarstan has signed a decree today, October 17, banning quasi-military organisations in the republic. The decree is aimed, in the first place, against the People's Resistance of Tatarstan (3,000 strong) set up on the initiative of the Tatar Public Centre in August. At first the organisation was supporting the president, now it has turned against him.

The implementation of the decree has been trusted to the Interior Ministry Forces which have been put on the alert and are now in control of the capital.

Referendum Demanded on Tatarstan State System

OW1810063091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The situation has stabilized in Kazan October 17, reports an INTERFAX correspondent. Many appeals have come to the republic's president and to newspapers from labour staffs for holding a referendum on the state system and membership of Tatarstan in the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

On the same day a rally was held at 12:00 in Bugulma also demanding a national referendum on the status of the republic.

Yakutiya To Hold Presidential Vote 20 Dec

OW1710195891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Yakutskaya republic has amended its Constitution at today's session, Thursday [17 October], by introducing presidency and passing an appropriate law. It has also set the date for the first universal presidential election—December 20.

INTERFAX reports the law states that any citizen of the republic can stand to be elected executive president at the age from 40 to 60 having lived in the republic not less than 15 years and commanding both the Yakut and Russian languages.

The right of nomination belongs to political parties, public organisations, labour staffs, populations of various localities, and army units.

International Affairs

Deputies Discuss Russian-Baltic Accords

LD1810025291 Moscow TASS in English 2238 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 18 TASS—A meeting of the working group of people's deputies to prepare for ratification interstate agreements between the Russian Federation, on the one hand, and Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, on the other, took place in the House of Russian Councils here on Thursday [17 October], the press service of the Russian parliament presidium announced.

Aleksandr Granberg, the leader of the group and chairman of the Committee on Interrepublican Relations, Regional Politics and Cooperation, made a report, outlining the group's main tasks and organisational structures.

The agreements are expected to be ratified at a Russian parliament session in the second half of November.

Security Chief on Cooperation With CIA

LD1810095991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0245 GMT 15 Oct 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Kolesnichenko]

[Text] New York, 15 Oct—"For the first time in the history of relations between Russia and the United States, there have been meetings between high-ranking representatives of the security organs." This was stated by Sergey Stepashin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Security Committee, who was invited by a TASS correspondent to share his impressions of a week-long trip to the United States by a delegation from the Russian parliament. "We were received in the U.S. capital by the heads of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, of the FBI, of the customs service, and the antiterrorism and drugs squads, he said. Our conversations were held in a spirit of mutual understanding and desire to cooperate."

"Our visit to the United States, which a U.S. tour company began preparing several months ago, was initially intended to enable us to have a look around, stressed the Russian member of parliament. However, we decided to take full advantage of it. There were 15 deputies from various Supreme Soviet Committees on the trip. We split up into three working groups. The first dealt with economic problems, the second with security matters, and the third with the mass media."

In talking about his meetings with high-ranking representatives of U.S. intelligence departments, S. Stepashin noted that "good personal contacts had been established with colleagues in the U.S. security systems." "We had meetings all the time, he said. The most productive was a conversation with the CIA leadership lasting for over four hours. We talked about the political situation in the country and the republic. The U.S. intelligence department stated that in view of the victory of democratic forces in Russia after the failure of the attempted coup d'etat, the policy of creating the image of the enemy had fundamentally changed. The heads of the CIA stressed in particular that they have an interest in ensuring that democratic reforms in the republic are irreversible. They will work to promote the development of the economic and political processes."

"On the whole, stressed S. Stepashin, the meeting was very open. We were even shown certain CIA documents, instructions, and regulations concerning the Soviet Union which were stamped "Secret" during the period of confrontation between our countries. We were shown everything that we asked to see. We were told about the structure of the CIA and the FBI, and about special services' regulations. We were told about the numbers of people working for these organizations. We reached agreement on broad based cooperation between the intelligence departments of Russia and the CIA, going as far as an exchange of information between the RSFSR KGB and the CIA in the area of security. In particular, the heads of this U.S. intelligence body offered to help us set up and equip an information and analysis directorate at the Russian KGB. We also discussed the possibility of setting up certain joint units in Moscow and Washington. The conversation also spent a lot of time on discussing the campaign against international terrorism and drugs. An accord in principle was reached that a high-ranking CIA delegation would visit Moscow soon for talks on cooperation between the Russian and U.S. special services."

The chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Security Committee also talked about his meeting in Washington with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner. "During our conversation with the head of the North Atlantic alliance, we discussed forthcoming reductions in the size of the USSR armed forces, and expressed our desire to see a reciprocal reaction by NATO, stressed S. Stepashin. The time has now come when we can talk about close military and political cooperation with NATO in order to maintain security in the world. Furthermore we can already raise the issue of Russia becoming a member of this international alliance. If the NATO leadership invites us to become a full member of the organization our response should be purely positive. That would lead to a sharp reduction in the armed forces of the USSR and of the alliance's member countries, and would also remove political tension in East-West relations. I have been invited to address the forthcoming session of NATO in Madrid. I would like to raise this issue in my address."

Japan's Nakayama Continues Working Visit

Views Relations With Sobchak

LD1610212891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1831 GMT 16 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Fomicheva]

[Text] St. Petersburg, 16 Oct (TASS)—Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama, who is in the USSR on a working visit, arrived today in St. Petersburg. He had a conversation here with Anatoliy Sobchak, the city's mayor. Attention focused on questions of Soviet-Japanese relations and problems of mutual interest.

Anatoliy Sobchak proposed that Japan take part in building a high-speed rail line between St. Petersburg and Moscow and in providing help with supplying the city on the Neva with medicines. The mayor said that the Japanese side would be granted the most favorable status for conducting business in the city, emphasizing readiness to facilitate the opening of branches of Japanese banks and firms in St. Petersburg.

Taro Nakayama promised to inform his country's business world about the proposals made by the mayor of St. Petersburg. In turn, he presented Anatoliy Sobchak, a well-known lawyer, with a proposal for making efforts to settle the problem of the "Northern Territories".

Tomorrow the guest from Japan is scheduled to visit a children's hospital and the "Baltic Works" association.

Welcomes Economic Reform

OW1610214391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Part of the $2.5 billion given by Japan as aid to the Soviet Union will be invested in the programme of a free economic zone in the Petersburg region—as announced by the Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama during his Wednesday's [16 October] meeting with St. Petersburg's Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak.

T. Nakayama welcomed the economic reforms by the mayor's office and also the restoration of the city's historical name. In their talks A. Sobchak and T. Nakayama discussed a number of other important problems.

Discusses Territorial Issue

OW1710033491 Tokyo KYODO in English 0105 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] St. Petersburg, Soviet Union, Oct. 16 KYODO—The reformist mayor of St. Petersburg, Anatoliy Sobchak, on Wednesday [16 October] told Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama that the time is ripe to settle the long-standing territorial dispute between Japan and the Soviet Union.

The territorial issue could be solved if it is considered on the basis of treaties, arrangements between the two countries, and international law, Japanese officials quoted Sobchak as saying.

Although Sobchak did not further elaborate on treaties and arrangements, he was apparently referring to the 1956 Joint Declaration which pledged to return Shikotan Island and the Habomai group of islets to Japan, and other documents, as valid arrangements, the officials said.

Sobchak was quoted as saying, "I am a lawyer. If we think of the issue based on treaties, arrangements between the Soviet Union and Japan, and international laws, the problem will vanish," the officials said.

Sobchak also told Nakayama,"a favorable climate of law and justice has been prepared now. The time is ripe," and indicated his willingness to help solve the problem, the officials said.

The reformist mayor said it was a mistake for the Soviet Union not to sign a peace treaty with Japan during negotiations of the 1956 joint declaration because of differences over the territorial dispute, the officials said. Nakayama and Sobchak also discussed economic cooperation during the talks at the city hall. Sobchak expressed hopes of Japanese investment in hotels, restaurants, and department stores in the Leningrad province, of which St. Petersburg, until recently called Leningrad, is a part, the officials said.

Sobchak also expressed interest in applying Japanese know-how in connection with a high-speed train project between Moscow and St. Petersburg.

The Japanese foreign minister promised to convey Sobchak's proposals to related Japanese ministries on his return to Tokyo.

Nakayama is scheduled to return to Moscow on Friday [18 October] and to leave the capital Friday night to conclude his six-day visit to the Soviet Union.

Receives Gift From Kozyrev

LD1610224191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2100 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama ended his talks with Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev today. Official protocol was as scrupulous as ever, but the fact that the second round of their talks was held on Staraya Ploshchad in the office of former Vice President Yanayev caused slight perturbance in the Japanese delegation. However, Kozyrev assured them that he was not continuing the practice of the former occupant.

A second incidental fact: Kozyrev, on behalf of the Russian Government, seems to have been the first to present a foreign guest with an elegantly presented piece of piping from the barricade outside the White House. The gift was accompanied by a certificate of authenticity. As if we have not had enough of this, with those prize pieces of the Berlin Wall.

Kunadze Assesses Results of Talks

OW1810052891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Report on interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze by reporter Zudolov in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] On 16 October, Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama completed the official itinerary for his Soviet visit. He left Moscow on 16 October and headed for St. Petersburg.

The Soviet and world mass media have reported extensively on the results of the talks between Foreign Minister Nakayama and the Soviet and Russian leadership. During Foreign Minister Nakayama's stay in Moscow, Radio Moscow reporter Zudolov met and conducted an interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze of the Russian Republic, who participated in the second round of the Japan-Russia foreign ministerial talks. Zudolov asked Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze whether there is any possibility for remarkable movements or progress in Soviet-Japanese relations in the near future.

[Kunadze is briefly heard speaking in Russian, then fading into Japanese translation] From the nature of Soviet-Japanese and Russian-Japanese relations, we can expect substantial changes. The prevailing desire to have a constructive dialogue and atmosphere of mutual understanding in all the talks and negotiations conducted by Foreign Minister Nakayama during his stay in Moscow indeed underscored such a possibility. Of course, we understand that any major change will still be linked to the resolution of the issue of territorial delineation. I think, on the whole, this is compatible with the reality. However, on the other hand, I think we must not overlook a more important point. I refer to disentangling the territorial issue; that is, the solution of the issue has become what you might call a hostage of previously accrued bilateral relations. Unfortunately, there has been the problem of a great lack of mutual understanding and a continuous tendency to suspect the other party with a hostile attitude in Soviet-Japanese relations. In the past two or three months, we have been able to effect a decisive change in such a trend in the relations with Japan. This is a sign of substantial change toward the improvement of bilateral relations. Undoubtedly, this will also affect the signing of a peace treaty and the resolution of the various issues relating to territorial delineation.

In other words, we are at the point of making an important decision. We hope that a solution will be reached soon. The talks conducted in Moscow confirmed that it is not only necessary, but also possible to find a common language between the two sides, such as optimism and [words indistinct]. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the present Soviet visit of Foreign Minister Nakayama has been a very signficant political event. As far as I know, the Japanese side does not also hide its satisfaction with the results of the talks with Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Pankin, Kozyrev, and other Soviet and Russian leaders.

Nakayama's Trip Reviewed

OW1610231091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1733 GMT 16 Oct 91

[By M. Mayorov and I. Porshnev; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Evidently the prognostication of Georgiy Kunadze, Russia's deputy foreign minister, that the visit to Moscow by Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama cannot be expected to yield extraordinary results was fully justified. The Japanese foreign minister and his Soviet counterpart B. Pankin exchanged two letters. One of these concerns trips to Japan without visas by Soviet citizens living on the islands of Kunashari, Etorufu, Shikotan and Habomai and trips to these islands by the Japanese. The first such trips are to take place as early as this year. The second letter provides for raising the quota of reporters permanently accredited in the USSR and Japan from 30 to 50.

As for the main outcome of the present talks in Moscow, it's evidently reflected in the fact that Russia and the USSR, on the one hand, and Japan, on the other, agreed as to the need to intensify their work on concluding a peace treaty. Witness the results of meetings held by the Japanese foreign minister with the USSR President M. Gorbachev and with Russia's President B. Yeltsin. According to Andrey Grachev, head of the Soviet President's press service, this involves a process based on the principle of reciprocity and envisaging certain phases that cannot be ignored.

Russia's president spoke about this even more frankly. Following his meeting with T. Nakayama, B. Yeltsin reaffirmed his adherence to the five-phase approach to resolving the territorial dispute with Japan he had outlined earlier. In the current circumstances it's necessary to add dynamism to this process and seek to conclude it before the century ends, that is within the next nine years, the Russian president pointed out. Earlier B. Yeltsin allotted 20 years for the effectuation of his five-phase plan.

The substantial change in Russia's stand did not remain unnoticed. T. Nakayama assessed the program for resolving the territorial dispute suggested by President B. Yeltsin positively. We, said T. Nakayama, discussed in detail the possibility of stepping up the implementation of the five-phase plan and signing a peace treaty as soon as possible. He handed to the Russian president a message from the Japanese prime minister who invited him to come to Tokyo for an official visit.

In the meantime some people seem to be dissatisfied with the prospects of settling the territorial dispute with Japan. Russian People's Deputies Sergey Baburin and Nikolay Pavlov who visited Sakhalin and the Kurils recently declared once again at a press conference held in Moscow on Tuesday (the day when M.Gorbachev and B. Yeltsin conferred with T. Nakayama) that for them "there is no problem of Northern Territories, but there is the problem of reviving the Kuril Islands as part of Russia." According to them, "territorial recarving is inadmissible."

Their tour, said S. Baburin and N. Pavlov, convinced them that the head of the administration of Sakhalin region Valentin Fedorov took the right stand. The possibility of turning the four islands of the south Kurils chain over to Japan and stands for creating a free economic zone there. [sentence as received] Most people living in Sakhalin region and on the disputed islands oppose the prospects of Japanese jurisdiction over them. As for the Kuril region council, it proclaimed its intention to adopt a declaration of state sovereignty in case of "Russia's betrayal."

S. Baburin and N. Pavlov declared their intention to meet with Russia's President B. Yeltsin to discuss this problem. According to them, this issue should be discussed by a joint parliamentary session or even by the congress of Russian people's deputies.

Unlike S. Baburin and N. Pavlov who are at odds with the Russian leadership, the chairman of the Sakhalin region council Anatoliy Aksenov believes that "the Japanese side is largely to blame for what is happening on Sakhalin and Kuril islands." He made this statement also on October 15. The sensational reports that the territorial dispute has virtually been settled emerged for the first time in the Japanese press, he pointed out. According to A. Aksenov, in the course of debates on such a serious issue these steps on the part of Japan only delay solution to the problem, not contribute to resolving it. With reference to talks with Japan A. Aksenov said that they should be held, even though "to give up one's territory is bad in general, and doubly inadmissible at a time of crisis in the country."

In other words, to resolve the territorial dispute with Japan at the moment is hardly possible without taking into account public opinion on the Kuril Islands and in Russia as a whole. The Japanese are beginning to realize this too. In any case a prominent official from Russia's Foreign Ministry told DP's [Diplomatic Panorama's] correspondent that Tokyo's decision to grant aid to Moscow in the amount of two and a half billion dollars was prompted in particular by its desire to break old stereotypes, change public opinion in Russia and present Japan to the Russians in the image of a friend, not enemy. According to the diplomat, the example of Germany indicates that this task is quite accomplishable.

Russia, Japan Continue Debate Over Kurils

Yeltsin Unhappy With Kunadze Trip

OW1710212491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At his meeting with spokesmen of Russia's parliamentary parties President Boris Yeltsin censured the results of the recent trip to the Sakhalin and Kuril Islands by the federation's Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy Kunadze. That was revealed to the press after the meeting by the People's Deputy Sergey Baburin who quoted B. Yeltsin as saying that he now understood the situation.

(During his stay in the Sakhalin region G. Kunadze intimated that handing the islands Habomai, Shikotan, Kunashiri and Etorofu over to Japan was inevitable, causing an outcry from the local population and leadership—IF [INTERFAX])

S. Baburin, also fresh from a trip to the region, expressed hope that the joint session of both parliament houses will debate Oct 23 the problem of the Kuril Islands with the participation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and also Georgy Kunadze. S. Baburin added that the head of the Sakhalin administration Valentin Fedorov will arrive in Moscow to take part in the discussion.

Yeltsin Remarks on Five Steps

OW1710143691 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1200 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Excerpt] [Announcer Sonada] Good evening. As we reported yesterday, as a result of Foreign Minister Nakayama's visit to the Soviet Union, there has been an agreement on the establishment of a working committee for the solution of the northern territories issue, and on visa-free visits by Japanese citizens to the territories. But there still exist in the Soviet Union differences of views surrounding the issue of the northern territories.

While such is the situation, Russian Republic President Yeltsin, who holds a major key to negotiations for the return of the territories, granted a joint interview to NHK's Moscow Bureau and Russian Television a little earlier. In the interview, he made a rather delicate remark referring to five steps regarding the northern territories which he has proposed so far, and said the five steps are not five steps for solving the issue, but five steps for negotiations.

Please listen to the remarks by President Yeltsin.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Have the borders of the Russian Republic been fixed?

[Yeltsin speaks in Russian; Japanese subtitles] Yes, internationally.

[Correspondent] What do you mean—internationally?

[Yeltsin] I mean the borders with foreign nations surrounding the Russian Republic.

[Correspondent] In the south Kurils, the establishment of businesses is considered urgent. What is your view on it?

[Yeltsin] Since the south Kurils have been designated a free economic zone, there has been a rush of applications for permits to open businesses there. The fact that there are now five step negotiations going on with Japan has had an influence on it.

[Correspondent] Do you mean the five steps for the solution of the northern territories issue?

[Yeltsin] No. The steps are not for a solution. The five steps are for negotiations. [end recording]

[Begin relay with NHK's Moscow correspondent Kobayashi in Moscow] [Sonoda] Mr. Kobayashi in Moscow.

[Kobayashi] Yes, I am here.

[Sonoda] He has so far talked about five steps for a solution. It appears that the expression has been changed to five steps for negotiations. This can be interpreted as a delicate way of going backward. How shall we view this?

[Kobayashi] Regarding the question on whether this is going backwards, I think I can give you two answers—yes and no. The reason I say yes is because President Yeltsin stands on a position of having to be very wary of public opinions. As you know, the power of President Yeltsin is derived from the enthusiastic support of the people. But as regards the northern territories question, the overwhelming public view is that there should be no concession on it. His remark comes under this condition. The reason I can say no is because negotiations on the northern territories question have already begun between Japan and the Soviet Union. Mr. Yeltsin sent in his Vice Foreign Minister Kunase as chief delegate of a Japan- USSR subcommitee to discuss the northern territories question. Mr. Kunase is a man supporting the reversion of the territories. I can say no from that aspect. [passage omitted] [end relay]

Two Deputies Reject Handover

PM1710154991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Oct 91 pp 1,2

[Interview with People's Deputies S.N. Baburin and N.A. Pavlov by N. Garifullina; place and date not given; first two paragraphs are introduction: "Views, Positions: Homeland Not For Sale"]

[Text] Some $1 billion. That was roughly the amount of "humanitarian aid," according to SANKEI SHIMBUN, that the Japanese side promised at the talks currently under way in Moscow for the South Kurils to be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Land of the Rising Sun.

But it was not so much that as the ambiguous, even blatantly pro-Japanese stance held by a number of the Russian administration's official representatives that roused a wave of protest on the Kurils and Sakhalin, visited recently by Russian People's Deputies S.N. Baburin and N.A. Pavlov, members of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet.

I spoke to them straight after their news conference in the White House 15 October.

[Garifullina] Sergey Nikolayevich, Nikolay Aleksandrovich! A few minutes before the aircraft left for Vladivostok 6 October, we agreed that you would tell SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's readers on your return everything that had seen and heard on the Kurils....

[Baburin] In just six days we visited so many places and met so many very different people—in terms of their political sentiments, social sympathies and antipathies—that we can hardly remember anything like it in our entire time as deputies. In Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk we were introduced to the leadership of Sakhalin Oblast—our colleague, RSFSR People's Deputy Valentin Petrovich Fedorov, chairman of the oblast executive committee, Anatoliy Petrovich Aksenov, chairman of the Sakhalin Oblast Soviet, and like-minded deputies from Sakhalin's oblast and city soviets—and got firsthand information so to speak about the visit here by the official Russian delegation headed by G.F. Kunadze, deputy foreign minister. We went to the Kuril Islands with Fedorov accompanied by journalists.

We saw for ourselves that the crime against Russia—you cannot call it anything else—began to be perpetrated in 1956 with the evacuation from these islands of Russian people on an administrative basis. Yet they had their settlements, enterprises, and schools there. There was a four-grade school on the island of Polonskoye, where we made a stopover. Now there is nothing and no one left there, except for a border outpost.

Apart from studying the Kuril problem, we, as part of our responsibilities as deputies, also acquainted ourselves with the progress of economic reform on Sakhalin, along with the new structures that have been set up by the executive and Sakhalin's soviet organs.

[Garifullina] Before leaving, Nikolay Pavlovich, you said that your suggestion that the Russian Foreign Ministry leadership explain its stance to deputies immediately was rejected by the Soviet of Nationalities. What specifically alarmed and drove you on your way?

[Pavlov] The question of the Kurils has in theory been under discussion for a long time—both in the press and in various political circles. You remember early this year Atrem Tarasov aired his view that Gorbachev wants to sell the Kurils to Japan—and for that the wish was expressed that judicial proceedings be instituted against that businessman-cum-deputy for slander under the Law on Defending the Honor and Dignity of the President. But here is the direct purpose of the trip. There were reports in the press that Valentin Petrovich Fedorov, the then chairman of Sakhalin Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies Ispolkom [Executive Committee], sent a cable to Russian President B. Yeltsin demanding that Georgiy Fridrikhovich Kunadze, Russian deputy foreign minister, be removed from his post. The details—what actually happened there and precisely was it was all about—were never reported. Some other deputies and I demanded a hearing for Foreign Ministry representatives at the Soviet of Nationalities session 2 October in order for them to provide us with objective information about the situation surrounding the Kurils. The chamber did not accept the suggestion because a number of deputies, V.P. Lukin, chairman of the International Affairs Committee in particular, (incidentally, he effectively represents Sakhalin Oblast—V.P. Fedorov gave up his seat in the Soviet of Nationalities to him, a deputy from Moscow) persuaded deputies that it was extremely undesirable for the Soviet of Nationalities to examine this matter saying that talks with the Japanese foreign minister begin 15 October and this could complicate them. He asked for the matter to be postponed until later.... We might have rested here had it not been for Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov's press conference 3 October. When asked by a KYODO correspondent whose view Kunadze was expressing in saying bluntly on the Kurils that Russia will abide by the letter of the joint USSR-Japanese declaration of 1956 on the transfer of the two islands. Khasbulatov did not confirm or deny this statement. He said evasively that a situation is now developing whereby the plan that B.N. Yeltsin proposed at one time before he was president or chairman of the Supreme Soviet, but only an opposition leader and a USSR people's deputy, may now be implemented in phases.

The five-phase plan, as is well-known, had no concrete substance and was suggested for an indefinite period, "for future generations." But what Khasbulatov said at the conference caused concern and disquiet. What did he actually have in mind? What plans are being hatched behind deputies' backs? The content of Yeltsin's letter which Khasbulatov gave to the Japanese leadership during his recent visit is also a closely-guarded secret. We are only familiar with Georgiy Kunadze's account of it. All this has caused concern. It has not proved possible to find out the truth by parliamentary means. As Supreme Soviet members we thought that we simply had to fly out there and study the situation on the spot so as to be prepared for the Supreme Soviet discussion that will obviously ensue.

[Baburin] What did we immediately encounter on the spot? The people of the Kurils were simply stunned by the shocking revelations made by our colleagues who had visited there recently. We saw that the RSFSR deputy foreign minster, during his meeting with Shikotan's leaders, said unequivocally: Opposition from you may complicate our talks with Japan but the islands will still be handed over! Coming from a representative of the

Russian leadership this shocked the people of Sakhalin and the Kurils. What interpretation did various politicians put on the Russian president's stance and his letter to the Japanese Government! Really, how could the following revelation by Georgiy Kunadze in his interview with SIBIRSKAYA GAZETA fail to cut to the quick? Citing the president, he said (and I quote):

"Boris Nikolayevich said outright: We would be grateful for special [ekstrennyy] wide-ranging economic aid from you enabling us to buoy up our people's enthusiasm for democracy during the difficult months ahead."

If you note that this is said in the context of the general talks with Japan, those on the territorial question included, that sounds more than strange.

Local leaders and citizens of the Kurils were disappointed by what Deputy Oleg Kalugin said. As a KGB general they expected him to give an objective assessment of the islands' strategic significance, and of their role in defending Russia's state security and state interests. Let me explain. These are our only ice-free straits, whereas all straits between the North Kurils freeze over. Kasatka Bay with its deep waters is unique from the military point of view; the Japanese Navy massed in this bay in 1941 before the attack on Pearl Harbor and the Americans were unable to detect it at the time. But General Kalugin, regrettably, not only calmly "tried to convince" the people of the Kurils that the islands need to be handed over, but also stressed their uselessness from the viewpoint of state security: We have no problem defending the country now, he said, there is no need to defend ourselves against anyone and retain guarantees of sovereignty and of our independence. Times have changes, he said. Everyone was simply stunned, very many people whom we met and to whom we spoke told us this in indignation.

[Garifullina] Now, you know the Kuril position "firsthand." What is it?

[Baburin] I would like to give a few examples. Shikotan's peasants appealed to Patriarch Aleksey II of all Russia:

"Most Holy Father, the Christians of the Russian Kurils appeal to you, do not allow violence to be committed, innocent tears to be shed, and an increase in the numbers of our homeless and unfortunates. Make those politicians who can decide men's destinies with a stroke of the pen, see reason. The residents of the South Kurils are in danger. Do not let our islands be turned into another Alaska. Who will stand up for us? All our appeals to politicians whom you have blessed have remained unanswered. The money from the sale of the islands will not bring relief but will be swallowed by the maelstrom of general confusion as has happened to all previous loans. But the deed will be a burden for several generations to come and remain on our conscience as a grave sin. Help us, Holy Father!"

And it is not only the Christians who espouse that stance. Similar appeals have been sent to the Russian president, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the Sakhalin Oblast Soviet, Japan's Emperor Akihito, and Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu....

[Pavlov] Generally speaking, most citizens living on the islands share a common position: This is Soviet, Russian land. And this is despite the conditioning of public opinion that has begun by every possible means—and I stress that—ranging from promises to threats. On the one hand, pressure is applied and people lose confidence, some have even despaired, saying: "Well, what difference does it make to us where we live." That's sad to hear.

At the same time the people of the Kurils are simply being lured by shameless promises. Despite that, most people refuse to hear of the islands being sold or handed over. It's their land, their homes. When Sergey Nikolayevich and I say that the problem of the "northern territories" does not exist, but there is a problem with the social and economic development of the Kurils, we are not only voicing our own "extremist" viewpoint, as some people try to present it, but the opinion of most of the people of the Kurils. We say that most responsibly because we have listened to people and had meetings where we did not speak at all, but only listened, and that's very important.

We now know the stance held by the presidiums of the Sakhalin Oblast and City Soviet, the Veterans Council, trade unions, and local entrepreneurs, which is of quite some importance. Valentin Fedorov—a vigorous supporter of enterprise, even though his critics may think him somewhat extreme—is someone who puts the emphasis on private business and is making tremendous efforts to revive the economy. We drove around about 15 farms and visited private enterprises which use imported equipment to make cheese, to smoke fish, and to process sea products. They all hold one position: There can be no question of handing over the islands at all.

[Baburin] That is not only the position espoused by the people of the Kurils, but also that espoused by everyone on Sakhalin. A resolution adopted by a large rally in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk 4 October said most definitely:

"Our people have not put aside such hallowed concepts as patriotism, the Fatherland, and gratitude to past generations and their outstanding men for Russia's advance eastward [as published]. We ask RSFSR President B.N. Yeltsin to display consistency on the Kuril issue. We remember your promise on the Kurils during your visit to Sakhalin and Kunashir last year. We think that territorial questions are out of place nowadays. If Russia's leaders capitulate to Japan's demands, they will be committing a crime against their own people. A crime for which the people will not forgive them. We proceed on the premise that territories belong not to governments but to the people who live there.... The inhabitants of the oblast are adamant in their determination to defend these islands...."

We saw that this was not only a position stated at a rally. Very varied people—veterans who have lived on the islands since the fifties, those who liberated these islands, our generation, and young people—espouse very definite positions. It was galling and painful to hear what a woman who has lost her trust in any politicians had to say. She literally wrung the words from her heart: "Give me the weapons and I will defend my home myself!"

[Pavlov] Needless to say, we believe that common sense will triumph and the matter will be closed once and for all; therefore we do not share this woman's call to arms, but we can understand it in human terms.

[Baburin] You notice that even when there were tempting promises that every resident of the Kurils resettled on the mainland or Sakhalin following the transfer of the islands would be given $1 million, that idea was rejected out of hand by most of the residents. Out of hand! The Kurilskiy Rayon Soviet Presidium even adopted a special decision.

Those who are regrettably indifferent to the islands' fate today are generally people who have already despaired. They expect to receive compensation from the Japanese Government—if not $1 million then at least $50,0000, we were told—and an apartment on the mainland. That's a crazy idea, a false illusion!

[Garifullina] At a press conference you both said that the Kurils are not four rocks in the ocean, but a whole world. What are they, for example, from the economic viewpoint?

[Pavlov] The four rocks myth was created around one year ago. There is no lie more cynical and farther from the truth.

The Kurils are a whole country. I do not want to bore you with figures, but I will say, for example, that the longest island, Iturup, is 243 kilometers long and 30-40 kilometers wide. It is about the size of one of the larger oblasts in the central area of Russia. Kunashir is approximately the same size, Shikotan a little smaller. The population is around 25,000. The economic potential is massive.

As for fish resources, the annual catch is approximately 1.5 million tonnes of particularly valuable types of fish, as well as invertebrates and other seafood. The value of stocks of raw material for the fish industry is more than $1 billion per year.

The Kurils are a repository of a variety of minerals. The value of proven and predicted stocks of gold stands at approximately $1.2 billion; silver—$3.4 billion (incidentally this is at 1 January 1988 world market prices).

There are also areas of complex ores with a zinc content of up to 20 percent, copper content of up to 12 percent, and lead content of up to 15 percent.... They used once to be worked, incidentally. The total value of predicted resources is $9.7 billion.

The Novoye sulfur deposit is ready for working. Given an average world price of $91 per tonne, the total value of sulfur resources is around $5.6 billion....

But this is just a cursory look, to give you an idea. In fact, you would need the whole paper and more to provide a full picture of the economic potential. Incidentally, Western experts are well aware of the Kurils' riches, but until recently the figures were considered secret here and were not published. So people got the wrong idea: "Why hang on to them, there is nothing there, after all!"

Add to that the wealth of opportunities for the organization of tourism, recreation, and so on. It is a unique zone with an unspoiled ecology, valuable mineral waters, opportunities for organizing health facilities.... In short, from the economic, purely utilitarian viewpoint, which is what dominates people's thinking at the moment—but what is it actually worth?—there value cannot be calculated at this moment in time. Even at this moment in time! Not to mention the fact that their value, naturally, will increase. But, anyway, I would avoid making such calculations, because that is not the main issue.

[Garifullina] There is a serious political element in the Kurils issue....

[Baburin] It is perhaps the most significant factor. Are there any grounds for Japan's claims to these islands? One normally refers to the 1956 declaration. But, from the political and moral viewpoint, this declaration was glaringly unconstitutional and antinational, because it was another attempt to get some immediate advantage from the sale of territory: guarantees from Japan that it would not participate in a military-political bloc with the United States and would not allow U.S. military bases on its territory. That was the general burden of the talks, although many conditions were missing from the text of the declaration. And it was Japan's reneging on its commitments that led to the USSR Government's repudiating the declaration. But it made a legal hash of this, because no government decision can revoke a declaration ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Furthermore, it has to be said that the basic principles cited by the Japanese side can scarcely be accepted unconditionally. First of all, there is the 7 February 1855 treaty signed by Admiral Putyatin and the 25 April 1875 treaty signed by Prince Gorchakov. For some reason, our neighbors consider these treaties to be the only documents regulating relations between the two countries. But a close reading of the documents leads one to conclusions that are very different from the Japanese side's interpretation.

Supposing the treaty signed by Gorchakov is clear: Russia will hand over the Kuril Islands to Japan. It does not mention Iturup and Kunashir, but only because they had been unilaterally seized by Japan in 1799 and 1801. However, it nullified all these treaties when it took advantage of Russia's weakness at the beginning of the 20th century and seized Sakhalin. Japanese militarism's expansion nullified many of the principles of mutual relations between Japan and Russia.

Not to mention the fact that even the first document, in 1855, on the basis of which the Japanese declared "northern territories" day, on closer scrutiny reveals Nicholas I's desire, by means of a territorial concession, to "open up" Japan, that is, obtain certain economic advantages. It is a tragedy for our people that for nearly 150 years now we have been trying to sort out economic relations with Japan by bargaining over territory!

Having familiarized myself with certain historical sources while in Shikotan, I unhestitatingly suggested to the Kuril islanders that they declare 6 July Kuril Islands day. Why? According to archive data, it was on that day in 1778 that the largest number, compared with other days, of Ainu—the indigenous population of the Kuril Islands and North Hokkaido—took Russian citizenship. It was long before Japanese officials appeared there. So if it is a question of who came first—although this is not the level of political discussion, of course—let us have that festival in the calendar.

[Pavlov] The relevant information is in the archives. There are books, documents, collections. Japanese—yes, Japanese!—books, moreover, that our diplomats do not know about, apparently. One Japanese scholar, who spent 30 years working in the archives, came to the conclusion that Japan has no claim to the islands.

[Baburin] We would not want to present any final findings at this point, since our trip and the press statement at the press conference are a preliminary account of our stance before the parliamentary hearings. But we are prepared to repeat here and now that there is no "northern territories" problem.

[Garifullina] I know you intend to meet with the Russian president. What is your package of proposals on the problem of the Kurils?

[Baburin] I would like to say something specific about this. I would highlight at least three aspects. In the first place, Nikolay Aleksandrovich and I deem it necessary in the very near future to secure the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's or RSFSR President's adoption of a legislative act on the problem of the Kurils—their economic and cultural revival—similar to the one adopted in Tyumen Oblast.

[Pavlov] It could be a presidential decree. As someone from Tyumen Oblast, I was suprised, on visiting Sakhalin and the Kurils for the first time, how very similar the problems were. They were pumping out the oil and gas and leaving nothing for the oblast. They are "pumping out" the fish and leaving nothing for the oblast and the Kurils That is where all the problems come from. It is obvious. The president issued a decree on the development of Tyumen Oblast, so the oblast now keeps 10 percent of the oil and gas that are produced. I think that a political decision, for example, in the form of a resolution by the Congress of People's Deputies, on denouncing the 1956 declaration, to close the matter once and for all, should be immediately followed by a decree by President Yeltsin on the development of the Kuril Islands. It would be welcomed as a long-awaited measures, reinforced by the authority of a nationally elected president. It would be an enormous political and moral breakthrough in the minds of millions of Russians, who—and I have to say that I am not referring to admirers of President Yeltsin—had doubts about his position. I think it was no accident that Boris Nikolayevich, at the first Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, rejected accusations that he wanted to hand the Kurils over to Japan. All the inhabitants of the Kurils can remember him saying during meetings: "We are not going to give up the islands, are we, you guys?" "We are not!" the Kuril islanders replied. So a political decision now has to be taken that will greatly, massively strengthen the president's position and close this sad chapter of popular anxiety.

[Baburin] That is the first aspect. But we must remember, of course, that there have been several programs for the economic development of the Kuril Islands. At all levels. So we must not confine ourselves, as we have done in the past, unfortunately, to making another declaration. Second: We intend to propose to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and president that they support the initiative by the Sakhalin leadership—V.P. Fedorov and A.P. Aksenov—on the creation of a special economic zone based on the Kuril Islands. Not a free economic zone like the whole of Sakhalin Oblast, but a special one, which, if it incorporated the South Kurils, could only be set up if the Japanese side reciprocated: The adjacent part of the island of Hokkaido might also be included in the zone. It is our belief that the talks with Japan must proceed from these positions: In order to remove both the tension in our relations with our eastern neighbor and a barrier to the economic development of this region, it is necessary to set up a special economic zone.

Third and last, I am convinced that we are making a fatal mistake today by throwing ourselves into the quest for foreign credits. They are poison to our economy. We were in full agreement on this matter with the Sakhalin leaders. We agree in our assessment of the situation: The very credits that many of our politicians are pursuing will help preserve current economic relations, shore up obsolete power structures, and hamper the development of the new economy.

So I deliberately said that it was just as important for us to acquaint ourselves with aspects of the economic transformations. We saw that reforms are already under way in Sakhalin, albeit with some contradictions, and if the present trend continues and Kuril enterprises' economic independence is ensured the oblast has a future. In view of the way the reforms are currently proceeding in Sakhalin, in Kuzbass, and many other places, we must say once and for all that priority goes to home enterprises, people's enterprises! So let us give our Russian farmers the chance to get on their feet. We welcome the

Fedorov principle: "Hands off the administrative system! Create a new one—then it will die of its own accord." The chief priority now rests with the new economic structures, but preserving the state order and only gradually reducing it. While ensuring normal conditions for the activities of existing production facilities. We believe this is something many regions could learn from Sakhalin.

[Pavlov] We must not launch a headlong attack on the old, but develop new economic structures alongside, in tandem with the old.

We must not hold talks with Japan from a position of weakness, but from the position of the mighty Russian potential. We must be aware of our own identity, uniqueness, singularity.

[Garifullina] ...And remember the dignity of a great country and a great people....

[Pavlov] I believe we are interested in cooperation with Japan, as is Japan with us. When it is suggested that there can be no peaceful cooperation without a peace treaty, and allegedly there cannot be a peace treaty unless the territorial question is resolved, this is frivolous in terms of serious politics.

There is another question: What kind of neighbor does Japan want to have? Certainly, one that is democratic, strong, prosperous, and amenable to intercourse and cooperation. But for some reason Japan thinks that it will get such a neighbor by solving the territorial question in its favor and then granting us credits. It is profoundly mistaken!

It would have a neighbor in which extremely adverse processes, as far as democracy is concerned, would begin to develop. When our Soviet people see that the new democratic power began by giving up territory in exchange for credits, no one will be deceived by assurances that these are unrelated matters.

The Kurils precedent would revive existing claims on us by a number of other states. One entrepreneur said at the meeting that in Finland recently local partners had told him that in no circumstances should the Kurils be given up, otherwise Finland would immediately make territorial claims on Russia. That is something they fear, incidentally. Why? Businessmen are intelligent, pragmatic people, and they see that it would immediately complicate relations. If there were a mass attack of that kind, and even Latvia and Estonia are already staking claims, ultimately you might have a regime in power that would again militarize the economy, and Japan would have the antithesis of a democratic, peaceful, freedom-loving, and congenial neighbor. Japan would also be vigorously arming itself, and then worldwide destabilization would begin.

[Garifullina] What were your feelings as you left the Kurils?

[Pavlov] I felt wretched. Our national dignity has been trampled on. People feel spurned and deceived. People who fought at the front for the salvation of the country can see that their lives have been in vain, that all has turned to dust. If tens of millions of people are seized by this feeling a leader will appear who will focus this energy. I do not think he will be a kind, tender, and democratic leader. And we will be back to the place we were trying to escape from. Would that be in anyone's interests? Not in ours or Japan's, I think.

[Baburin] The wretchedness is intensified by the fact that the betrayal of our territorial interests in the Kuril area is officially, but not in actual fact, a first. The Kuril islanders are worried not only about the fate of their islands, but also about the situation in the Barents Sea. As a result of an agreement between the governments of the USSR and the United States we gained around 9,000 square kilometers of the economic zone, while ceding 60,000 to the Americans! The handover of 51,000 square kilometers of Soviet territory, above all continental shelf territory, is so contrary to common sense and notions of our national interests that we are hoping, of course, that the agreement will not be ratified by the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets, since it is is Russian territory.

[Pavlov] We intend to ensure that territorial questions that relate to Russia are considered by Russians.

[Baburin] The Kuril islanders said that they would not bargain with the homeland and advised others to do likewise. If Russia abandons them they will reserve the right to decide their own fate as they think best, including state sovereignty.

Our position is clear: The Kuril Islands belong to Russia and there can be no question of any redrawing of borders.

Letter to Yeltsin Urges Compromise

PM1710111891 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 17 Oct 91 First Edition p 7

[Letter to Russian President Yeltsin from I. Zhdakayev, USSR Supreme Soviet member from Sakhalin Oblast, followed by Vladimir Solntsev commentary: "South Kurils: Ours or Not Ours"]

[Excerpts] [Zhdakayev letter] To Russian President Comrade B.N. Yeltsin.

Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich! The artificially created situation concerning Sakhalin is potentially explosive.

There have recently been a number of irresponsible statements by members of your entourage, to the effect that the Kuril Islands could be a bargaining counter in talks with Japan. This has caused justified indignation among citizens throughout Sakhalin Oblast. Since they feel that they are an integral, inseparable part of Russia, they have no desire to be subjects of a foreign state.

During your visit to Sakhalin you stated specifically that the Kurils will always remain Russian. The attempt to resolve difficult economic problems at the expense of the people living in the Kurils, at the expense of Russian territory, is a crime against history and a violation of the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Russia, which points to the impermissibility of any territorial changes without taking the people's will into account.

Now more than ever before we need a public, principled stance by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president on this matter.

You only have to say that we will not give up the Kurils in any circumstances—and this will immediately lessen the tension on the islands and reinforce people's faith in Russia's strength.

The Russian president's silence not only affects your personal prestige, but could lead to tragic consequences for the whole country.

Boris Nikolayevich, time will not wait!

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Member I. Zhdakayev, Sakhalin Oblast.

[Solntsev article] "We are learning a higher style of argument. Fact-free argument. Argument based on temperament. Argument progressing from unsubstantiated assertions to the personality of the adversary...." Mikhail Zhvanetskiy presumably was not referring to the argument that has dragged on for many years over the territorial status of the islands of the southern part of the Kuril chain which are now part of the USSR and which the Japanese refuse to describe in any way other than as their own northern territories.

The flames of emotional outbursts were fanned by a series of recent pronouncements by both Russian and Union figures on the need to speed up the settlement of the territorial problem, which some people saw as indicating the desire to obtain the long-awaited large-scale Japanese aid speedily in exchange for Iturup, Kunashir, Khabomai, and Shikotan. Among those who see things this way is Valentin Fedorov, chairman of Sakhalin Oblast Soviet Ispolkom [Executive Committee], who declared his ispolkom to be the "headquarters of the struggle for the Kuril Islands" and called on the local population to protest in any way they can.

Things have even reached the stage of personalities, or rather, one personality—that of RSFSR Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy Kunadze, who visited the Kurils the other day with the tough task of telling the local inhabitants the truth about the "northern territories." And although, as he said, there can be no question of a deal and the Russian leadership will in no circumstances forget the interests and future of the Soviet people now living in the South Kurils, this did not stop the "chief of the Sakhalin headquarters" from sending a telegram to Russian President Boris Yeltsin demanding the resignation of the "pro-Japanese" Kunadze.

Fedorov's fierce indignation is understandable—the return of the South Kurils to Japan has no place in his concept of building capitalism in Sakhalin Oblast in isolation. But emotion is a poor counselor when it is a question of resolving a problem that is so serious and, if I may express my own view, has no simple answer from either the historical or the legal viewpoint.

And so, the historical aspect. [passage omitted]

The official Soviet position, which for a long time was based on the view that the territorial question "has already been resolved" or simply "does not exist," was vigorously backed up by references to the 1945 Yalta agreement between the USSR, the United States, and Britain. In their desire to bring the Soviet Union into the war against Japan, Washington and London were prepared after the victory over Japan to pay for it by satisfying Stalin's appetites, which extended to the Kuril Islands, from where the local Japanese inhabitants were evicted unceremoniously.

I think a key role is played in the question of the ownership of the "northern territories" by two documents which form an integral part of the postwar settlement. The first is the 1951 San Francisco peace treaty, whereby Japan—which to this day declares its intention of complying with this treaty—renounced its rights to the Kuril Islands, thereby paying for its aggressive role in the war. But it is significant that this treaty, which the Soviet Union did not sign, does not say in whose favor it renounced these rights. Nor does it contain a clear answer to the question of which specific islands count as belonging to the Kurils, and this enables Tokyo, in its official stance, to claim that Iturup, Kunashir, Khabomai, and Shikotan do not belong to the Kuril Islands, and to describe their being part of the USSR as a continuing unlawful occupation.

Document number two is the Joint Soviet-Japanese Declaration of 1956. And although it was signed 11 years after the end of World War II, there is every reason to regard it too as a component of the postwar settlement, because it was under this document that the state of war between Japan and the USSR was formally ended and diplomatic relations were restored between them. The Soviet Union, the declaration says, in particular, "meeting Japan's wishes and taking into account the interests of the Japanese state, has agreed to hand over the islands of Khabomai and Shikotan to Japan." The actual handover of these islands, it was stipulated, is to take place after the conclusion of a peace treaty.

It is quite obvious that the Joint Declaration should be observed by both sides as a document which was ratified by the two countries' parliaments and thus acquired the force of law. And from the viewpoint of international law there is nothing at all convincing in either the USSR's 1960 refusal, in classic Khrushchevian spirit, to observe its commitments on the pretext that a new security treaty had been signed between Washington and Tokyo, or the view expressed during USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan this year to the effect that history has determined otherwise—or, let us add, in the Japanese Government's attempts to pose the question thus: first the four islands, then the peace treaty.

Justice and legality therefore demand that the islands of Khabomai and Shikotan be handed over to Japan after the signing of a peace treaty. But what about the much larger Iturup and Kunashir, especially since Tokyo's attempts to declare that they do not form part of the Kurils, to which Japan has renounced its rights, are not taken seriously even by many Japanese and can easily be refuted on the basis of Japanese sources? The effective absence of any bilateral documents retaining legal force that would provide an unequivocal answer to the question of the territorial status of these two islands dictates the need for a political compromise or third way, one option for which could be joint possession and government of the islands.

I think this option would also suit many Soviet people living in the South Kurils today, who naturally are not in the least to blame for the fact that they became hostages to Stalin's expansionism, and are rightly demanding that their vital interests be taken into account.

St. Petersburg Mayor Ends Prague Visit

Cites 'New Stage of Interaction'

LD1510165791 Moscow TASS in English 1644 GMT 15 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vitaly Yaroshevsky]

[Text] Prague October 15 TASS—St. Petersburg City Hall and the Prague Municipality have signed a declaration to establish friendly ties.

The signing of the declaration today completed St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoly Sobchak's visit to Prague. The document confirms mutual readiness to cooperate in the economic and cultural spheres, education and sports.

"A new stage of interaction is beginning between our two cities," Prague Mayor Milan Kondr said. "Now we should substantiate good intentions with specific deeds."

Sobchak noted that it is better to move towards a democratic society together so that "magnificent Prague and no less magnificent Petersburg flourish for their residents' benefit."

"I would like our people to meet more often and really make friends, rather than speak about friendship," Sobchak said.

Sobchak said the visit and talks held here were very important for him. He said a step towards a new system of relations between the two countries and peoples had been made in Prague.

"So far, these relations were built between states via corresponding ministries and departments. Now we are creating another society, where the most significant role is attached to enterprises and business people. It is very important to use every opportunity to develop direct economic and cultural ties," Sobchak said.

Sobchak told TASS that during a meeting with Czechoslovak business people, they discussed creating a new mechanism for Czechoslovak-Soviet economic ties and reached full understanding on the issue.

"The sides agreed that there are good chances for developing such a scheme. The two countries have expressed their interest in this and it is now up to us to realise the intentions," Sobchak said.

Warns of Dangers of Nationalism

PM1710153791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 p 4

[Report by unidentified correspondent: "Overcoming 'Absurd Extremes.' A. Sobchak on the Problems of the USSR and East Europe"]

[Text] Prague, 16 Oct—Although Anatoliy Sobchak arrived in Prague almost at the same time as Israeli President Hayim Herzog, the popular Soviet leader was by no means overshadowed. On the first day the "Petrograd head man" (that, for some reason, is what the Czechoslovak press calls him) was received by President V. Havel, Deputy Premiers P. Rychetsky and J. Dienstbier, and Czech Premier P. Pithart.

The guest was followed each step of the way by journalists. A press conference was held on the results of the day-and-a-half visit at which A. Sobchak frankly shared his ideas about the processes currently taking place in the USSR, Czechoslovakia, and other so-called postcommunist countries.

Touching on the threat of the spread of nationalist and fascist tendencies, Sobchak said that this is a problem not only for the USSR, but for Europe and the entire world. Just as in the Middle Ages the plague spread across borders, so now the bacillus of nationalism has infected all of Europe like AIDS. Look at what is happening in Yugoslavia, Sobchak said. Unfortunately, even in Czechoslovakia there are people prepared to cause dissension between your peoples.

The bacillus of nationalism, the Soviet guest continued, always emerges during troubled times of transition. If we are talking about the real danger of nationalism in Russia, it will be very great if the crisis should deepen and if we fail to overcome the deterioration already evident in people's lives. If we had a more favorable economic backdrop—to the standard of today's Czechoslovakia, for instance—we could say that there was no such danger.

It is very important not to sow dissension among people at the moment, A. Sobchak went on to say. I would call this explosion of nationalism the "postcommunist syndrome" because it is linked with the relations which existed under so-called socialism, when attempts were made to reduce everyone—irrespective of their nationality, traditions, religion, or views—to a common denominator and make them as similar and as close to each other as possible. The reaction to this has now started. We are living according to Hegel: We are going to the other extreme, from one absurd idea to another. Overcoming absurd extremes is now a task both for our people and, clearly, for yours.

As an example A. Sobchak cited the Czechoslovak law on holding office (on lustrations—PRAVDA editor's note). I rule out the possibility, the speaker continued, of any such law being passed in our country. I do not wish to interfere in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs, but the adoption of such a law in Russia would mean civil war.

I will cite two examples from our present-day life. The first is Georgia. A year ago the republic's population voted almost unanimously for President Gamsakhurdia—around 90 percent placed their trust in him. But I would like to recall that Gamsakhurdia's main thesis was "Georgia for the Georgians." A year later this man's rule has caused disruption not only among all the peoples living in Georgia, but has also set his own people at odds to such an extent that people have taken up arms and started to fight each other. Even today murders are occurring.... What is happening in Georgia has absolutely nothing to do with any kind of democracy, it is a tragedy for the people.

Lithuania is another example. A law has been passed there on the possible return of lands to the people who used to own them. And what is happening now? It is already 50 years since the war. People—and mainly Lithuanians—have been living on this land, have worked it, and have built their homes on it. Now Lithuanians are returning from other countries, reestablishing their right to the land, and starting conflicts.

A. Sobchak also shared with the assembled journalists his idea for organizing 20,000 private farms on the territory of, as he put it, Leningrad Oblast—which, incidentally, is bigger than the total area of Czechoslovakia. Each of these farms could have 50-100 hectares under their control.

In conclusion the mayor of St. Petersburg made a high assessment of the talks held in Prague.

Belorussia

Kebich Supports Economic Treaty Signing

LD1810051091

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 0230 GMT on 17 October broadcasts a five-minute report by Minsk correspondents Mokritskiy and Zhuk on the proceedings of the Supreme Soviet of Belarus, which has been discussing the economic situation in the Republic. Reports on the interrepublican agreement formulated in Alma-Ata, and on the state of the economy, were delivered by Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich, who explains to one of the correspondents that "I would like the economic cooperation agreement between republics that want to sign this treaty to be signed on the 18th," and that "we wanted the people's deputies of the Supreme Soviet to express their views on the basic categories, so we can sign this document with more confidence than if we had not discussed this issue in parliament."

Asked whether the economy is stabilizing, Kebich says that "seeing how Belarus looks compared to other republics, I would have to say that as far as that is concerned we are not on the verge of crisis, first and foremost regarding food. As fas as food is concerned, I do not foresee any reductions by the end of this year or into the next; we are staying here at the former level of per capita consumption. In non-food goods, we are certainly not producing fewer of them, but here we come right up against the question of how to protect our market against exportation. Regarding material-technical provision—where enterprises or agriculture undertake to supply the Republic's market, this will be backed up as a matter of obligation with centralized resources of goods and materials; if it is to go the market outside the Republic, naturally the enterprises, on the basis that we are switching to market conditions, must look after their own provision with these resources. And the final block of issues concerns our international activity, first and foremost as we are an independent state. Not one state can exist today, as far as I can see, without foreign economic independence."

Parliament Favors Signing

LD1710193391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1806 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Minsk, 17 Oct (BELTA-TASS)—A closed session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet has debated the signing of the interrepublican economic agreement. In an interview with BELTA correspondents, Stanislav Shushkevich, the chairman of the republic's parliament, had the following comment on the outcome of the debate: "I am setting off for Moscow with the intention of signing the treaty. Belarussia needs it."

Belorussian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich added: "In this document, which must unquestionably be signed, there is not a single line that harms the interests of the republics."

Currency Introduction, Border Issues Noted

OW1810063291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Belarus is pondering an introduction of its own currency—the republic's Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kabich said at the session of the Supreme Soviet Oct 17.

To a question on eastern borders he replied it was not only for the government, but also for parliament to decide. He remarked that so far "goods are being drained from the republic".

On the foreign indebtedness which hampers relations with foreign partners V. Kebich admitted that the republic's share in the USSR debt is no less than 4 billion foreign echange rubles.

Chernobyl Closing Suggested

OW1810033591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Belarus republic has appealed to the Ukrainian parliament following the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power plant on Oct 11 suggesting a complete closure of the plant next year.

The economic effect of operating that plant, goes the appeal, is negligible compared to the great risk and tragedy of the people in Belarus, the Ukraine, and Russia.

Moldova

Panel Backs Signing Economic Treaty

OW1710195591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Moldova's standing parliamentary commission on economy and budget has unanimously spoken out for signing the treaty on the new economic union.

The commission has also given recommendations to parliament urging Moldova to join the Union as full, not associated, member—as suggested by some politicians.

An emergency session of Moldova's parliament meeting Friday October 18 in Kishinev will appoint the republic's delegation to be sent as observer to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

People's Front To Boycott Elections

PM1710105591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 p 1

[Correspondent A. Pasechnik report: "Moldova: President Spoke Too Soon..."]

[Text] Kishinev, 15 Oct—...Meeting with journalists recently and replying to a question, Moldovan President Mircea Snegur stated that the opposition in the republic had not yet taken shape and was only at the initial stage.

It seems that he president spoke too soon! A few days later, last Sunday, a session of the People's Front of Moldova [PFM] Executive Committee decided to oppose the current state authorities in the republic and to boycott the nationwide presidential elections scheduled for 8 December. In declarations adopted on this score the front pins the blame for the current acute situation in the republic on the republic's leaders. As for the elections, the PFM leaders have a whole package of arguments in this area to explain, in their opinion, why the elections should not be held now.

This abrupt step by the PFM—following the expulsion of the Communist Party of Moldova from the political scene it has become probably the only really influential sociopolitical movement here—has caused considerable alarm in the republic. Local press publications, which have been under PFM control for some weeks now, are directing quite an intensive hail of criticism against the president.

Certain local observers believe that the front's radical leaders do not like M. Snegur's balanced and largely centrist position based—particularly of late—on consideration for existing economic and political realities. Fuel has, of course, been added to the fire by the president's recent resolute statements that there can be no question of any unification between Moldova and Romania at the moment. This realistic position from the republic's leader seems to clash sharply with the PFM's strategic course—a course which, for instance, was very unambiguously defined in a recent interview by Front leader Yuriy Roshka: "...today's Republic of Moldova will soon be reunited with Romania, perhaps in six months or a year." That, in the opinion of observers, is the main component of this stark confrontation.

But who else will get involved in what, judging by everything, will be a difficult presidential campaign?

Snegur Opposition Unites

PM1710105191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[Eduard Kondratov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "People's Front in Opposition to Snegur"]

[Text] Kishinev—The Moldova People's Front at its republic conference resolved to boycott the republic presidential elections, which are scheduled for 8 December.

Having declared itself the official oppositon to the parliament and the president, the People's Front promised to make broad use of a tried and tested weapon—mass rallies and pickets. Issuing a direct challenge to President Mircea Snegur, who considers the existence of two sovereign Romanian-speaking states feasible, the opposition is setting itself the aim of frustrating the election of the president.

It is another question whether they have the resources for this. Despite having "its" people in the parliamentary presidium and having ideological control over the television, radio, and a number of Moldovan newspapers, the People's Front can no longer count on the former support of the masses. The overt orientation toward the rapid reunification of Moldova and Romania has undermined its popularity among inhabitants of villages and rayon centers—the main stronghold of the national radicals. That is precisely why the People's Front has not nominated its candidate for the presidency but has decided to fight Snegur, who has a very high pre-election rating, in a covert alliance with its ideological enemies—the Dnestr "separatists"—who will probably also campaign for an election boycott.

If these extremes unite against the presidential center, they will have to be taken seriously.

Youth Party Election Boycott

AU1710153991 Paris AFP in English 1405 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Chisinau [Kishinev], Soviet Moldova, Oct 17 (AFP)—The influential Democratic Youth Party (DYP) in the western republic of Moldova said Thursday [17 October] it would boycott presidential elections and called for a reduction in presidential power.

The announcement came after Moldova's largest political organization, the Popular Front, said Monday [14 October] that it too would boycott the elections and go into opposition against President Mircea Snegur and the parliament.

DYP spokesman Ion Trisea told journalists the DYP wanted measures to divide political power more evenly between the executive and the legislative before it would take part in the republic's presidential elections.

The DYP, which has a strong presence in schools and universities in Moldova, claims membership of over 100,000.

The Popular Front favors Moldovan unification with Romania and right-wing members strongly oppose Snegur's campaign to make Moldova an independent state.

Voters in the self-proclaimed republic of Dnestr, which also opposes the Moldovan drive for independence, have also threatened to boycott the elections.

Dniestr officials have said that the republic's mostly ethnic Russia voters would take part in the ballot only on condition that Moldova agreed to take part later in elections for a federal Soviet president, journalists said.

The elections are still scheduled to be held on December 8 and campaigning began earlier this month. There are so far five declared candidates, including Snegur, and more were expected, journalists said.

Moldova formally declared its independence shortly after the failed Soviet coup d'etat in August.

Agriculture Minister Guarantees 'No Famine'

OW1710195791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "I can confidently assert that we'll have no famine," said Moldova's Deputy-Premier and Minister of Agriculture and Food Processing Andrey Sangeli.

Under the economic agreement signed in Alma-Ata Moldova is to expect 1,100,000 tons of grain.

Besides, A. Sangeli mentioned talks with Poland and Czechoslovakia on grain purchases. Poland is ready to sell Moldova about 300,000 tons of grain in exchange for other food stuffs.

As to fruit and vegetables, Sangeli says enough of them have been stored for the winter.

Gasoline Prices Established on Monthly Basis

OW1710215491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

["Energy Crisis in Moldova?"—INTERFAX headline; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Moldovan State Department has announced that prices on gasoline and diesel fuel will be established monthly depending on changes of market prices, as well as expenses related to delivery of fuel to the republic.

Experts say the recent twice as much price increases on oil products will not completely solve the problems of the repbulic. That is why in November Moldova will have to introduce market prices on gasoline and diesel fuel. And according to an agreement between Moldova and Russia, beginning from January 1992 Moldova will pay for oil products shipped from Russia at world prices which is about $2 billion.

An IF [INTERFAX] correspondent reports Moldova consumes annually 900,000 tons of gasoline, 1,300,000 tons of diesel fuel and 2,800,000 of black oil.

Ukraine

Kravchuk Unwilling To Sign Economic Treaty

LD1810083291 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 18 Oct 91

[By UKRINFORM correspondents Aleksey Petrunya and Ivan Saiko]

[Text] Kiev October 18 TASS—"The Ukrainian parliament presidium has decided that no one of us will sign any agreement unless all the republic's proposals are analysed and taken into account," Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk said on Thursday [17 October].

"We do not intend to sign an agreement we have not seen," Kravchuk told trade union activists in Kiev. The Ukrainian parliament presidium decided that unless "the document is submitted to us, and unless we analyse it thoroughly with specialists, parliament experts and the cabinet, we cannot take part in the signing of an economic agreement."

Kravchuk noted that the Ukraine favours developing political, economic, spiritual and other ties with all states, including with former union republics. The Ukraine will not join any unions or communities or sign agreements if they somewhat infringe on the republic's sovereignty, he said.

Kravchuk noted that economic agreements, bilateral or multilateral, are important for the republic, now that all ties are being broken and enterprises are on the verge of stoppages. Such agreements can be signed between republics, and later their representatives will be able to meet and discuss all existing problems, he said.

Objections To Treaty Noted

OW1710204591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The delegation of the Ukraine is not going to sign the Treaty on Economic Union, as an INTERFAX correspondent has been told by the Deputy-Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Ivan Plushch.

It follows that the republic's leadership cannot accept 27 clauses of the treaty, including ones on a single banking and financial system, on setting prices, the principles of sharing the USSR's debt, and others.

Nevertheless, on Friday [18 October] the Ukrainian delegation led by I. Plushch and Vice-Premier Constantin Masik is leaving for Moscow where the treaty is to be signed Oct 18.

Signing 'Postponed'

LD1710212491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The Ukraine will not take part in the signing of the treaty on an economic community. This decision was made by the presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet because it did not receive the text of the treaty and supplementary agreements and it is unknown whether the remarks expressed by Ukrainian representatives at Alma-Ata were taken into account. The presidium explained that it does not mean that the Ukraine will not sign the agreement altogether. The signing is only being postponed.

Germany's Genscher Arrives for Visit

LD1710223991 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Kiev October 17 UKRINFORM-TASS—Hans-Dietrich Genscher, German vice chancellor and minister of foreign affairs, arrived here tonight for a visit.

The programme of his stay in Kiev includes meetings with republican leaders, members of the Ukrainian parliament Presidium, chairmen of commissions and leaders of party groups.

The guest will attend the opening of a weeklong German culture festival in the Ukraine.

Chairman on Chernobyl Fire Consequences

PM1510101491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 91 p 1

[Correspondent M. Odinets report citing remarks by V.D. Gladush, Ukrainian minister of state and chairman of the government commission to investigate the fire at the Chernobyl AES (Nuclear Power Station): "After the Accident at the Chernobyl AES"]

[Text] Kiev—What is the state of affairs now at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear power station] after the accident, what is the situation there today, what is being done to eliminate the consequences of what happened? V.D. Gladush, Ukrainian minister of state and chairman of the government commission to investigate the fire at the AES, who visited the power station with members of the commission, stated the following:

As soon as the fire was extinguished, the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers immediately set up a government commission of 14 people, which in turn formed expert groups on the radiation, technical, and fire aspects, an emergency repair operations group, and an information group. They were instructed to tackle the whole range of circumstances relating to the event at the power station.

The first press conference has already been held at Chernobyl; commission members answered questions from Soviet and foreign journalists who had arrived. It was noted that in contrast to the 1986 accident, this time journalists were immediately briefed on what had happened at the AES.

As for material damage, it is insignificant as a proportion of the value of the power station. In social terms, the damage is fairly substantial—700 megawatts of generating capacity was lost. And this is in the context of a situation where organic fuel resources are extremely limited. In essence, one-third of the power station is at a standstill, I mean the shut-down second unit. In political, moral, and psychological terms, the damage is great. It will undoubtedly affect the development of the nuclear power industry not only in our country, but in the world community. Any fire is a disaster, at a nuclear power station more so, and at Chernobyl even more. Hence the losses.

True, I must note with satisfaction that the actions of the Chernobyl AES personnel during the accident are assessed as satisfactory. They acted efficiently, decisively, and confidently. Immediately after the fire broke out, the nuclear reactor was stopped, shut down, and left to cool down. Fire service units, as well as other subunits set up on a national safety basis for emergencies, operated not only satisfactorily, but well. We will draw our final conclusions on the results of the investigation in the near future.

As for the cause of the fire, it was due to malfunctions in the control system of the second power unit's fourth turbogenerator. These affected the instruments. Whether this was due to interference in the operation of the system, or a defect in the system itself, or something else, will be established by the expert commission, which has at its disposal notes made by automatic recording equipment on technical documents.

As for the background radiation at the power station, it has not changed. The majority of foreign correspondents present at the news conference were able to see this for themselves at the accident site with their own pocket dosimeters.

At the site of the fire debris is now being cleared, the machine room is being cleaned, and preparations are being made for repair work.

No Radiation Leak Reported

PM1610165491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast: Report by V. Lyasakalo, V. Pisarevskiy, and Yu. Fedorov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer Tatyana Komarova] This morning everyone was agitated by the rumor of the fire at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. The possible consequences are not hard to conjecture but fortunately they did not occur.

[Lyasakalo] Another emergency at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station. On 11 October at 2100 hours in connection with failures in electrical equipment a fire broke out in the electrical generator of the second power unit and as the result of a hydrogen explosion part of the roofing of the machine room collapsed. The reactor unit did not suffer. The reactor has been shut down and switched to cooling mode. By midnight detachments of firemen had localized and then extinguished the fire. There were no injuries or deaths. The station's director, Umanets, stated that this accident is not a radiation accident. The radiation background around the station has not changed and a government commission is now working at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station, as is a group of independent experts from the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

[Komarova] There was no discharge or leak of radioactivity as a result of the fire. That was announced by Yuriy Izrael, chairman of the USSR Committee for Hydrometeorology. He cited information from the union ministry of atomic power and industry. David Kidd, a spokesman for the IAEA, also stated that the IAEA has no information that there has been a radiation leak into the surrounding environment as a result of the fire at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station. He said it is true that the agency was not immediately informed of the fire by Soviet official bodies but he did actually add that this is not prescribed by the rules if there is no discharge of radioactive substances. The IAEA expects that the first detailed report of the incident at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station will reach the agency at the beginning of next week, probably as early as Monday.

Restoration Work Continues

LD1810031791 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 17 Oct 91

[text] Kiev October 17 TASS—Restoration work is being conducted at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant after the fire on October 11. The fire broke out after an electric switch failed. It spread to the electric generator of the second power unit. The roof of the turbine room caught fire.

UKRINFORM learned at the press centre of the nuclear power plant that the third and fourth turbogenerators are being examined, that the engine room affected by the fire is being cleaned, the damaged metallic structures are being removed, the state of the building structures is being assessed and comprehensive measures to ensure reliable operation of power plants in autumn and winter are being implemented.

Load-carrying mechanisms are brought to the station. People from design, building and assembly organisations participate in removing the aftermaths of the fire, in addition to the personnel of the station.

The radiation situation at the station has not changed since before the fire. A governmental commission to investigate the circumstances of the fire continues working.

Georgia

Objections Preclude Signing Economic Agreement

LD1710190391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1809 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By SAKINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Tbilisi, 17 Oct (TASS)—"No Georgian delegation will travel to Moscow for the signing of the economic agreement, even as an observer." Givi Taktakishvili, chairman of the standing commission on economic reform of the Georgian Republic's Supreme Soviet, said this to a SAKINFORM correspondent yesterday evening. Until the criticisms voiced by the parliament's standing commissions and the Georgian Government about certain clauses in the draft agreement which infringe the republic's sovereignty are heeded, there can be no question, at the present stage, of an economic agreement or the Republic of Georgia's participation in it, he said.

Opposition Announces Immediate Goals

OW1510223391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1915 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A wing of the Georgian opposition has announced its immediate goals. Five parties united within the movement "Independent Democratic Georgia" and members of the opposition parliamentary factions "Democratic Center" and "Charter-91" have issued a joint statement proclaiming the need to release political prisoners, ensure the observance of fundamental human rights, liberalize the media and hold parliamentary elections no later than next spring.

Without awaiting the elections' outcome, the authors say, efforts should be taken to restore peace in South Ossetia, separate legislative, executive and judicial power, and officially recognize the integrity of private property and the freedom of entrepreneurship.

The opposition believes inviting a group of trustworthy international observers can facilitate normalization in Georgia.

Communist Deputies' Activities Banned

AU1510145791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 1

["Resolution of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Council on the Early Termination of the Powers of Those Deputies That Were Elected to the Representative Organs of State Power of the Republic of Georgia From the Communist Party of Georgia," adopted in Tbilisi on 8 October]

[Text] Based on Article 7 of the Republic of Georgia Constitution and Articles 1 and 10 of the Republic of Georgia law adopted on 10 August 1991 on political associations of citizens, the Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia, by its decision of 26 August 1991, banned the Communist Party of Georgia and terminated its existence and activity as an organization having thereby actually abolished this party's legal existence, registering, and registering for elections. In view of this, any political activity of the Communist Party must be discontinued. This activity mainly amounts to the work within representative organs of power of deputies from the Communist Party elected by citizens from lists of this political association.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia resolves as follows:

1. To terminate the powers of the deputies elected from the electoral lists of the Communist Party of Georgia (in accordance with the proportional and majoritarian systems) to the representative organs of state power of the Republic of Georgia (the Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia, the Supreme Council of the Abkhazian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the Supreme Council of the Adzharian Autonomous Republic, and the assemblies of towns, rayons, districts of towns, temis [small administrative unit], settlements, and villages of the Republic of Georgia).

2. The present resolution becomes effective upon its adoption.

Akakiy Asatiani, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia.

8 October 1991, Tbilisi.

'Widespread' Ire at Shevardnadze Questioned

PM1710100391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[Besik Urigashvili report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "In Tbilisi They Do Not Even Want to Listen to Mr. Shevardnadze"]

[Text] Tbilisi—The Georgian President's Press Service has released a statement on E. Shevardnadze's TV interview on Central Television 13 October which related to the situation in Georgia.

The statement says that the questions "read out by Mr. I. Fesunenko, not a resident of Tbilisi, and the answers given by a man who is detached from Tbilisi and who clearly gets his information from TASS and IAN sources, have caused indignation among the Georgian public." The statement claims that there has been and is no civil war in Tbilisi just as there are no "two sides to the conflict," because the attempted coup d'etat against the parliament and president elected by all the people failed.

"By its form and content, Mr. Shevardnadze's statement can only be viewed as provocation and an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign republic," representatives of the President's Press Service consider.

Central Television, in their opinion, is obliged first and foremost to reflect the anxieties and concerns of citizens of the republic itself and not impose on viewers the ideas of a former political figure.

There is nothing unusual or extraordinary in this statement. Accusations against the former leader of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and USSR foreign minister have become so customary and mundane that they are no longer noticed and do not arouse emotion. But what is interesting is how Shevardnadze's television statement was able to cause "widespread indignation among the public" when the program was seen only by those who receive the Orbita program, and there are not very many of them?

Villages Under Artillery, Missile Attack

LD1710133591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1217 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 17 Oct (TASS)—Armed conflict between the Georgian and Ossetian sides is gathering speed like a huge avalanche in South Ossetia. Last night Tskhinvali was again hit by intensive artillery and missile fire from the direction of the Georgian villages of Nikozi, Tamarasheni, Mevrikisi, and Eredvi. Housing in the southern and northern districts of the oblast center was badly hit and important municipal facilities damaged. According to preliminary figures, seven people have been wounded and taken to hospital. The Ossetians returned the fire.

Reports from the South Ossetia Information Committee press service say that the Znauri Rayon center is in a disastrous state. Georgian fighters are using artillery, missiles, helicopters, and armored vehicles in their bombardment of Ossetian population centers. In the last 24 hours alone more than 100 missiles have been fired on Znauri. Children, women, and the elderly are among the casualties.

Ossetians gave a positive reception to news that an appeal from the South Ossetian Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies had been sent to the presidents of the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the Russian parliament. It sets forth a demand for a state of emergency to be declared immediately throughout the territory of the autonomous oblast and for the question of South Ossetia entering the Russian Federation to be raised.

The local press carries a decree today from the Presidium of the North Ossetia Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet convening a session of the republican parliament.

There are more than 85,000 refugees in Vladikavkaz and other areas of North Ossetia. The influx is growing larger all the time.

Tskhinvali Under Fire

LD1710234791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 17 Oct 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Tskhinvali, in South Ossetia, was badly hit by intensive artillery fire from Georgian villages last night. Housing in several districts of the oblast center was badly damaged. According to an (INFORM-KURANTY) report from North Ossetia, there has been an upsurge in weapons sales to the population in Vladikavkaz. Guns are selling for 1,800 rubles in the gun shop, and only permission from the housing office need be shown to purchase one. There are long queues outside the shop. Observers link all of this to the deterioration in the general situation in the area.

Decree on Uzbek State Independence Noted

AU1510150791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 1

[Congratulatory address to the "Supreme Council of the Uzbek Republic" from Georgian President Gamsakhurdia and the Georgian Supreme Council, issued in Tbilisi on 9 October]

[Text] Esteemed deputies: The Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia and all the Georgian people applaud the struggle of the Uzbek people for freedom and democracy that was crowned, on 1 September 1991, with the declaration of the Uzbek Republic's state independence.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia recognizes the Uzbek Republic as an independent and sovereign state and as an equal subject of international law and expresses its readiness to start, at any time, negotiations with the authorities of Uzbekistan on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two states.
[Signed by]President of the Republic of Georgia,
Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia.
[Dated]9 October 1991, Tbilisi

Armenia

Ter-Petrosyan Seen as Election Winner

OW1710120691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to preliminary data, about 70% of those who took part in Wednesday's presidential elections in Armenia voted for the chairman of Armenia's parliament Levon Ter-Petrosyan.

As IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent was told at the central electoral commission, at least 70% of the electorate, and in some areas up to 90%, went to the polls.

The final results of the voting will be known this evening.

According to the central electoral commission, so far it has received no complaints in regard to the electoral procedures.

Preliminary Results Reported

LD1710174791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1516 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 17 Oct (TASS)—The victory of Levon Ter-Petrosyan is indicated by the preliminary results of the elections for Armenia's first president, in which over 1.47 million people, or 69 percent of the electorate, took part.

The Central Electoral Commission, which by law is allowed five days to announce the results, told a TASS correspondent that, according to preliminary data, after Ter-Petrosyan Paruyr Ayrikyan, a member of the parliamentary opposition, and actor Sos Sarkisyan, the candidate from the Dashnaktsutyun party, netted the greatest number of votes. For example, in Kotayskiy rayon, they were supported by 5.51 and 3.76 percent respectively of those who voted, and in Yerevan's Myasnikyanskiy rayon by 8.89 and 6.72 percent.

On the previous day, elections were also held for the 20 vacant seats in the Armenian Supreme Soviet, but the contest for the republic's highest state post somewhat eclipsed these partial parliamentary elections. Nevertheless, in the view of Ruben Kandayan, Central Electoral Commission secretary, they did take place, and over half of the electorate took part in them. The results will be known much later.

Election Official Interviewed

NC1710185591 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1600 GMT 17 Oct91

[Interview with Gemma Hasratyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Central Electoral Commission, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Ms. Hasratyan: It is obvious that a most responsible and important moment prevails in today's Central Electoral Commission work. Every resident of our republic wants to now as soon as possible who will become the first president of Armenia; which of the six candidates is the choice of the people. What do the preliminary results indicate?

[Hasratyan] I understand the voters' desire for the Central Electoral Commission to rapidly publish the results of the elections. However, all voters must realize that we first should make an exact comparison of the documentation from the regional [word indistinct] commissions with the results obtained by the electoral commissions in the polling centers. On election day, 1,231 electoral commissions were working. Over the night, 66 regional and city commissions gathered information from the polling stations, summed up the results, prepared and signed documents and, in the morning, presented them to the Central Electoral Commission. Our feeling of responsibility requires that we (?scrutinize) these documents more than once. We also have a computer system. The results are then fed into the computer and, after processing the results obtained from the last region, we will rapidly publish the (?final result). The (?process) is very complex. Our colleagues from the Statistics Department are also helping us. Naturally (?the results) have not yet come in from the remote regions. We fed the results from the (?15) regions at 1200 in the morning. We are continuing with this work.

[Correspondent] Can you give us any concrete figures for now?

[Hasratyan] Results cannot be given out right now because the final result should be published only after receiving the results from the last region in the republic.

[Correspondent] Mrs. Hasratyan, central news agencies have already filed reports about our elections and have said that Supreme Soviet chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan has received more than 85 percent of the votes. Where did they get their figures from?

[Hasratyan] I can state that the Central Electoral Commission could not have given this information to any organization or news agency. Your tactics are good, but my reply is obvious: We have not yet received the cables which should have arrived here last night. These news agencies are apparently making predictions after having visited the polling stations. I can say that the overwhelming majority of voters from which we have obtained the (?results) have voted for Levon Ter-Petrosyan.

I also think that voters should realize that Article 22 of the Armenian law on presidential election, says that the Central Electoral Commission on Presidential Elections, acting on documentation presented by the regional and city electoral commissions, is required to publish the final election results within five days. At that time, we must give a complete voter breakdown.

The Central Electoral Commission, however, does recognize that the people want to know the outcome and we will do everything possible to rapidly publish the election results in the press.

'Convincing Triumph' Reported

LD1810023691 Moscow TASS in English 2336 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan October 17 TASS—Preliminary data on the election of Armenia's first president are indicative of a convincing triumph of incumbent republican parliament chief Levon Ter- Petrosyan.

The counting of votes is not yet completed. As of 18:30, Moscow time, today, information on polling results came from 53 out of 66 cities and districts of Armenia. Judging by the information, over 83 per cent of the electorate voted for Ter-Petrosyan, a spokesman at the Central Electoral Commission told TASS.

The other presidential candidates are far behind. Paruir Airikyan, the "national self-determination" association chief—one of the leaders of the parliamentary opposition—polled 7.45 per cent of the vote, and Sos Sarkisyan, an actor, candidate from the Dashnak Party, got 4.15 per cent of the vote.

Zoriy Balayan, LITERARY GAZETTE's own correspondent, polled 0.437 per cent of the vote, and Rafael Kazaryan, corresponding member of the Armenia Academy of Sciences and chairman of the republican parliament Commission on Science and Culture, got 0.4 per cent of the vote.

The least number of votes backed Ashot Navasardyan, leader of the Republican Party of Armenia—only 0.1 per cent of the vote.

The Armenian presidential election law allows five days for the final counting of votes. But, considering a great interest in the election results, the Central Electoral Commission will do its best to finalise this work earlier than that.

The commission received no reports about any breaches of the electoral law during the polling, the commission spokesman told TASS.

International Olympic Recognition Sought

NC1510201291 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1930 GMT 14 Oct 91

[Text] Armenia's Olympic Committee has decided to ask International Olympic Committee [IOC] President Juan Antonio Samaranch to register of the Olympic Committee of the independent state of Armenia as a member in the IOC.

In keeping with the Olympic Charter, a country can become an IOC member if it is a member of five international sports federations.

Considering this fact, Armenia's Olympic Committee presidium has also decided to send cables to the international federations of the pentathlon, boxing, weightlifting, Greco-Roman and free-style wrestling asking for membership. These sports are widespread in Armenia.

Azerbaijan

Mutalibov Marks Italian Joint Venture

NC1710123491 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1800 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] President Ayaz Mutalibov has said the establishment of a joint venture by Azerbaijan and Italy in Baku is an example of the cooperation between the two countries' business circles. A jubilant ceremony was held today to open the joint (?maintenance) factory in Baku. The factory employees applauded the leading officials of the republic's ministries and industrial establishments and the Italian guests, including the representatives of the (Mirione Provject) Firm—which is one of the sides which has established the factory—when they arrived at the ceremony.

Ayaz Mutalibov addressed the ceremony, thanking the representatives of the (Mirione Provject) Firm [words indistinct], including its president, (Victorio Mirione), for the significant help they provided in establishing the joint factory. Mutalibov expressed hope that the cooperation between the two sides will be maintained. Ayaz Mutalibov asserted: The republic's relations with foreign partners will be of great importance in upgrading Azerbaijan's economy. They will help Azerbaijan enter the world market and enhance its sovereignty.

(Victorio Mirione) also addressed the meeting. He said he is prepared to cooperate with the Azerbaijani establishments in the future as well.

Kuliyev, director of the [words indistinct] production union in Baku; (Renato Makarto), director general of the (Mirione Provject) Firm; and Abdullayev, director of the factory, signed a protocol commissioning the joint establishment.

Citizens' Firearms To Be Returned

NC1710122091 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1800 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] The Azerbaijan Council of Ministers has instructed the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs to take measures to return the firearms that were temporarily collected from the people after the declaration of the state of emergency regime in Baku and in a number of rayons. The appropriate instructions have been given to the city and rayon internal affairs departments. The citizens who surrendered their firearms to the authorities now can collect them by submitting the certificates they were given at the time to the militia departments in their rayons.

Kemerli Resident Reportedly Taken Hostage

NC1710124191 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1800 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] Armenian bandits are continuing their provocative activities. According to the information we have received from the Kazakhskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, [name indistinct], a resident of Kemerli town, was taken hostage today by the Armenians. In addition to kidnapping this 65-year-old man, the bandits drove away more than 20 large-horned cattle. The militiamen who arrived on the scene were unable to locate the kidnapped man or the cattle.

Meanwhile, according to information we have received from Kel'badzhar, a large number of armed men have gathered in the Dzhermuk and [name indistinct] areas in Armenia.

Chernavin in Baku To Discuss Caspian Flotilla

PM1710152191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[From IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, INTERFAX, and REUTER roundup]

[Text] Navy Commander in Chief Chernavin arrived in Baku 16 October. It is believed that his conversations with the republic's president and defense ministry will continue the discussion on the Caspian Flotilla, the status of the KKF [Red Banner Caspian Flotilla], begun in Moscow on the initiative of the Azerbaijani side.

Provisions Convoy Leaves for Dzhul'fa Via Iran

NC1810101891 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1800 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] An AZERINFORM correspondent has reported that a convoy of vehicles loaded with provisions and foodstuffs has set out for the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic. The convoy has left from Astara. It will cross through Iran and arrive in Dzhul'fa.

Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast

Russian, Kazakh Observers Begin Contacts

NC1710213791 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1600 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] ARMENPRES correspondent Grigoryan reports from Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] that [words indistinct] the people of NKAO were not surprised with the arrival of the commissions and briefed the commission on incidents in a calm and businesslike manner. The people also provided comfortable accommodations for the observers.

On 16 October the observers held a meeting with the representatives of the Armenian and Azerbaijani sides in the NKAO to discuss organizational matters pertaining to the observers plans while there.

Reporters were unhappy about how the meeting was held because the sides conducted their contacts as far way as possible from the reporters. The observers caution is understandable, given the fact that many complex problems face them and they should in a relatively short period of time formulate conditions for [word indistinct] and a mechanism for its implementation. The observers have to work out measures for the restoration of the legal organs of power in the NKAO, define the status of the armed organizations in the conflict zone, and work out a mechanism for the pullout of these groups from the region with the exception of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry and Defense Ministry troops.

The observers will also have to deal with the disruption of the rail, air, and commutations systems; formulate measures to eliminate such disruptions within certain deadlines; and make efforts to solve other problems mentioned in the Zheleznovodsk communique.

On 17 October, the Russian and Kazakh observers divided into teams and left for the various NKAO regions. Representatives of the Armenian leadership of NKAO are accompanying them on their tours.

The renown public activist Baroness Caroline Cox, speaker of the British House of Lords, also arrived in Stepanakert in a humanitarian mission after visiting the villages in Shaumyanovskiy rayon today. After arriving, Ms. Cox visited a silk factory and met workers. She also visited Stepanakert's city hospital.

Foreign Observers Arrive

OW1710215391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A group of foreign experts and observers led by Baroness Caroline Cox, member of the British House of Lords, has arrived in Stepanakert today, Oct 17, accompanied by foreign journalists.

In an interview with INTERFAX Dame Cox said it was a fact-finding mission aimed at joining her peace-making effort with that of Russia's and Kazakhstan's observers. The delegation will visit the "hot spots": the Gadrut district of Nagorno-Karabakh and the Gheranboy (former Shaumyan) district of Azerbaijan bordering on it and populated with Armenians.

This is a third visit by Dame Cox to Nagorno-Karabakh.

Clashes in Mardakert Claim 10 Lives

OW1710162191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The commandant of the State of Emergency Region and the police department of Nagorno-Karabakh say 10 more people were killed in the autonomous region during Wednesday [16 October] and Wednesday night.

Father and son Gulyan were killed in the Mardakert District on Wednesday morning. In the evening, a car carrying four Armenians came under fire from the military near Stepanakert. One of the passengers was killed.

According to the Public Relations Center of the USSR Interior Ministry, the car was carrying "suspicious" passengers who exploded a hand grenade as the military made an attempt to detain the car. As a result, one passenger was killed and two interior troops were wounded. Preliminary investigation shows the passenger had intended to throw the grenade at the military but it exploded in his hands.

Late on Wednesday night unidentified persons broke into the home of the Danilyan family in the village of Tugh in the Gadrut district, where a ceasefire agreement had been signed a few days earlier, and killed everybody in the house: the head of the famly, his wife, son, daugter-in-law, and little grandson.

The commandant's office reports two Azerbaijanis were killed on the same night.

Newly Created Agency Issues First Bulletin

PM1710144591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 91 p 1

[PRAVDA-TASS report under the general heading: "Newsbeat"]

[Text] The KARABAKHSKOYE AGENSTVO NOVOSTEY [Karabakh News Agency] (KAN) has issued its first news bulletin in Stepanakert. A TASS correspondent has been told by its director, Marsel Petrosyan, that the agency has been founded by the Nagorno-Karabakh Executive Committee and the KAN creative collective.

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Comments on Talks With Genscher

LD1710214291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] German Foreign Minister Genscher has completed his brief official visit to Alma-Ata and has gone on—or, at least, that's what should have happened—to Kiev. Our correspondent Dukesh Baimbetov reports from Alma-Ata.

[Baimbetov] Mr. Genscher arrived here late evening, 16 October, but despite that he had an immediate meeting with Kazakhstan's President Nazarbayev. The dialogue between them continued this morning. All in all, they spent nearly 10 hours in conversation. Today's meeting was also attended by other Kazakhstan leaders. They discussed the prospects for the development of trade and economic ties between the two states and the expansion of contacts in all spheres of life.

At a news conference, Kazakhstan's President Nursultan Nazarbayev, in his capacity as host, was the first to speak.

[Begin Nazarbayev recording] Bearing in mind that a large number of German nationals live in Kazakhstan, we agreed on the opening of a Goethe cultural institute in Kazakhstan. We agreed to hold talks on the opening of consular institutions on a reciprocal basis. We agreed to hold talks on the opening of a direct air route and a communications system. We discussed questions relating to the provision of technical assistance to Kazakhstan and help with training our people, our youth, in educational establishments, and work experience in companies in Germany, for the training of managers and brokers—for the structure, that is, of the market economy. [end recording]

Genscher Encouraged by Talks

LD1710100591 Hamburg DPA in German 0839 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Alma-Ata (DPA)—FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has appealed to the USSR republics not to end completely their cooperation with each other. An agreement on a joint economic space would be an important signal to the West for further aid and for fundamental cooperation, Genscher said on 17 October after talks with Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev in Alma-Ata. He was encouraged that Nazarbayev had come out for the preservation of the Union.

Genscher and Nazarbayev agreed to intensify relations between the FRG and the second largest republic after Russia. There was a fundamental agreement on the exchange of consuls. A Goethe institute will be set up in Kazakhstan, and a direct air link to Germany is being considered. With German aid, Kazakhs are to be trained as economic experts. A German economic delegation will soon go to the central Asian republic to discuss joint projects. Genscher, who invited Nazarbayev to visit Germany, spoke of very useful talks which had given new fresh impetus to the development of mutual relations.

One of the most important issues was the situation of the 900,000 ethnic Germans in Kazakhstan. Germany wishes that they be provided with "favorable prospects" within the country and that they could develop their national and cultural identity, Genscher stressed. He also met representatives of ethnic Germans in Alma-Ata. Nazarbayev's comments on this issue were "extremely encouraging". According to Genscher, the federal government expected that, during his forthcoming visit to Germany, Russian President Boris Yeltsin will make proposals on how the old Volga republic of ethnic Germans will be refounded.

Another issue in the talks was the future of the Soviet nuclear weapons deployed in Kazakhstan. Genscher expressed his satisfaction with Nazarbayev's declaration that in the future these systems will remain under central control. Nazarbayev came out against a redeployment of the missiles stationed in his country, because this would be "too expensive". As a sovereign state, Kazakhstan will enter into negotiations about the future use of these weapons. They must also not be excluded from further disarmament negotiations. Genscher stressed Germany's wish that the republics adhere to all treaties concluded with the Soviet Union.

After his two-day stay in Alma-Ata, Genscher is traveling to Kiev, in the Ukraine, where he will open a German cultural festival and meet the political leadership.

Meets Ethnic Germans

OW1710223491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Germany's Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said at his Thursday's [17 October] meeting in Alma-Ata with Germans living in Kazakhstan that one of the aims of his visit was to help those who have no intention to emigrate to Germany. "We respect any individual decision, while trying to do all possible to alleviate your life here," he eplained.

The German visitor mentioned the current discussion on a reasonable reduction of the growing influx of emigrants to the FRG. That may soon require changing Clause 16 of the country's Constitution. Genscher expressed regret over that swelling discussion since it alarms many German nationals. "We'll never close doors to you," he assured the Germans in Kazakhstan, "but we are interested in making your life here better."

Closer Contacts Sought

OW1710161991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has said Germany favors broader economic cooperation with Kazakhstan. He was speaking in Alma-Ata on Thursday [17 October] at a news conference summing up his talks with the Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev and said Germany was ready to "help Kazakhstan with know-how" in exchange for raw materials.

The German official expressed satisfaction with his talks with Mr. Nazarbayev during which the Kazakh leader had confirmed that "Soviet strategic systems will remain under central command." According to Mr. Genscher, this would be in Germany's interests, since his country would not like the number of nuclear powers to grow.

President Nazarbayev said most Soviet nuclear missiles were now deployed in Russia and Kazakhstan. He said transferring them to other regions would be too expensive, but that strategic systems on Kazakh territory "must remain under dual control."

Tajikistan

Rumors of Opposition Leaders' Deaths Decried

OW1810063591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2000 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Rumours are being circulated in Tajikistan that the opposition leaders as well as the Muslim head of the republic Akbar Ruraionsoda have all been killed in a road accident.

Talking with an INTERFAX correspondent the chairman of the Tajik popular movement RASTOHEZ (resurrection) Tahir Abdudiabor accused former Communist Party members of spreading such information to undermine the political opposition in the run-up to the presidential election coming in late November.

Turkmenia

Economic, Political Situation Assessed

PM1810084191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 91 p 2

[Report by A. Bushev: "Turkmenia: Over the Friendly Sands. Six Years of Calm Against a Stormy Background"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] S. Niyazov can definitely be regarded as a Gorbachev man. As first secretary of the Askhabad Communist Party City Committee the man who is now president of the republic was noticed in Moscow and invited to work at the CPSU Central Committee. He returned from there a major leader. He was suitable in many respects, in particular—and the cadre officers on Staraya Ploshchad had calculated well—because he did not have wide-ranging family ties here. Saparmurad Niyazov was an orphan—his parents were killed in the 1948 Ashkhabad earthquake.

Gorbachev had made the right choice. On returning to Turkmenia with the express task of supporting perestroyka, the new republic head did so pretty assiduously. Not once did Niyazov cast doubt either directly or indirectly on Gorbachev's actions. And that was at a time when there was a rapid turnover among Central Asian neighbors' administration leaders: One went to jail, another shot himself. Niyazov was in charge of Turkmenia, gaining a reputation in the center as the only republic-level leader in the country who had avoided not only bloodshed, but any incidents due to ethnic or other factors. He was also the country's first nationally elected republic president, obtaining nearly 97 percent of the vote. However, he still holds the post of Communist Party Central Committee first secretary.

After the putsch, Turkmenia, like many other republics, was absolutely free. In fact the republic leaders had always talked about this as a necessity, but they tended to do it in line with the spirit of the times. Freedom came so swiftly that they were badly confused in Ashkhabad. It suddenly became obvious that as well as the possibility of giving the captains from the center their marching orders, there was also the risk of losing guaranteed supplies of essentials.

In these conditions there is no discernible economic policy as yet. There is no end of talk about the need to switch to the market, but not a word about privatization, destatization, and other attributes of the market. The switch announced by Niyazov to world market prices in transactions with former union republics means only one thing: The president intends to improve the people's well-being by the old method of selling raw material, but, maybe, now to different customers. This is as far as the Turkmen leadership's economic thinking goes for the moment.

Despite the uncertain economic prospects, Niyazov promised the people that he would raise minumum pay to 1,000 rubles [R] per month in two-three years' time, without raising food prices. The president did not say how this would be done.

The Turkmen Communist Party, unlike the Tajik, for example, swallowed the bitter pill of departyization in silence. The secret is simple—some smart people in the party nomenklatura made plans for the future and a couple of years ago exchanged their party positions for positions in soviets. Those who replaced them did not have time to acquire either authority or influence. So the president, who evicted the Central Committee from the building in the center of Ashkhabad, did not have any particular difficulty reducing the party to the level of an ordinary public organization with no power.

Not one party is registered in the republic, apart from the Turkmen Communist Party. Although at least three opposition organizations exist illegally, they are not a serious force—I do not think many people in the republic are even aware of their existence. Recently members of the opposition decided to get together. A rather strange formation resulted. On the one hand, you have the so-called democratic movement, one of whose leaders criticized Niyazov in the paper GLASNOST, accusing him of the "immoral" eviction of the Turkmen Communists' headquarters from their beloved building. (After the item was published GLASNOST vanished from the republic's newsstands). On the other hand, the "Agzybirlik" society, a kind of embryonic national-democratic movement which appeared on the scene three years or so ago, accusing Niyazov of not paying enough attention to Turkmen language issues. When the Law on Language had been adopted, there was a hail of accusations that the fact that Turkmenia had been forced to join Russia had been hushed up. Recently Niyazov has been accused by the opposition of making a great number of political errors. Naturally, there is a matching reaction: Democrats are arrested and fined, or even imprisoned, on the slightest pretext.

On 26 October the inhabitants of Turkmenia are faced with another vote. This time they have to say whether they agree to Turkmenia becoming a democratic independent state. The referendum results are easy to predict—at least 90 percent will vote in favor. That kind of outcome is an old tradition for all mass votes in the republic. But what happens to the independent state thereafter is a much more difficult question. In my view, we can scarcely expect significant economic and political reforms in the immediate future: It will still have to sell raw materials stocks to keep its head above water. As far as it is able it will arrange trade relations with Iran, Turkey, India... But, by escaping from the close tutelage of the center it runs the risk of becoming even more dependent on Western businessmen, who are now trying to gain a foothold in the republic. And most of these businessmen are common swindlers, according to experts.

In my view there is little likelihood that the republic will be rocked by social, let alone interethnic conflicts in the immediate future: In Turkmenia the population is traditionally not particularly religious, in fact the authorities have full control of this sphere of social life. Anti-Russian or other nationalist sentiments are not in evidence, because of the small percentage of "nonindigenous" people, who, moreover, have long since ceased to play a part in the leadership of the republic. There are no signs of any clan or tribal differences...

At the moment there is only one force capable of opposing the authorities, given the chance. Strange to say, it is trade workers. It is the odious store and warehouse managers and also those above them who, in the opinion of many, are the real power in Turkmenia. A power President Niyazov does not exactly fear but has to take into account.

In other respects, as before, the people at the top want, while the people down below are able to live in the old way.

President Niyazov Views Economic Union

LD1710163691 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By correspondent Lyudmila Glazovskaya]

[Text] Ashkhabad October 17 TASS—"There is a need for an economic union and we should be part of it to prevent the rupture of economic ties", Turkmenia's President Saparmurad Niyazov told a meeting of the republic's Presidential Council.

"This does not go against our plans to declare independence for the republic soon", he said.

Niyazov believes the new economic situation is complicated, but not hopeless. The republic has huge potential which should be effectively used. The president urged managers to be more critical of their own activity. "We should not allow profeteering and lawlessness with the connivance of managerial personnel to supplant a civilised market", he said.

Uzbekistan

Muslims Demand Mufti's Replacement

OW1710170791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Thousands of Muslims came to the square in front of the Muslim Spiritual Administration of Central Asia in Tashkent yesterday to repeat their demand that the present chairman of the administration, Mufti Muhammad Sodik, be dismissed and replaced by Abdelaziz Mansur, today's mufti of Tashkent and Tashkent Region.

The police and OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] did not interfere, having warned that they would confine themselves to the maintenance of the peace.

Muhammad Sodik is being accused of violation of sharia (Muslim law) and abuse of power.

There have already been several attempts to get Muhammad Sodik removed, the previous one having been made last July.